

\* \* \* \* \*

# The *Cronaca di Partenope*

\* \* \* \* \*

An Introduction to and Critical Edition of the  
First Vernacular History of Naples (c. 1350)

*Samantha Kelly*



# The Cronaca di Partenope

# The Medieval Mediterranean

Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400–1500

*Managing Editor*

Hugh Kennedy

SOAS, London

*Editors*

Paul Magdalino, St. Andrews

David Abulafia, Cambridge

Benjamin Arbel, Tel Aviv

Larry J. Simon, Western Michigan University

Olivia Remie Constable, Notre Dame

Frances Andrews, St. Andrews

VOLUME 89

# The Cronaca di Partenope

An Introduction to and Critical Edition of the First  
Vernacular History of Naples (c. 1350)

By  
Samantha Kelly



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2011

*On the Cover:* (Detail of) manuscript It. 281 (= alfa.H.8.14; formerly VIII.B.4) of the Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, Modena, Italy. With permission of the Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Caracciolo, Bartolomeo, d. 1362.

The cronaca di Partenope : an introduction to and critical edition of the first vernacular history of Naples (c. 1350) / by Samantha Kelly.

p. cm. – (The medieval Mediterranean peoples, economies and cultures, 400-1500, ISSN 0928-5520 ; v. 89)

Attributed to Bartolomeo Caracciolo.

Text in Italian; study in English.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-19489-2 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Naples (Kingdom)–History–Early works to 1800. I. Kelly, Samantha, 1968- II. Title. III. Series.

D847.A2C37 2011

945'.7–dc22

2011000254

ISSN 0928-5520

ISBN 978 90 04 19489 2

Copyright 2011 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.  
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,  
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.  
Fees are subject to change.

## CONTENTS

Acknowledgments .....	vii
Abbreviations and Stylistic Conventions.....	ix

### preliminary matter

I. Introduction .....	3
II. Original Text, Author, and Date.....	11
III. Historical Context .....	27
IV. Sources and Adaptations .....	55
V. Diffusion and Influence, 1350–1490 .....	79
VI. Manuscripts.....	103

### the cronaca di partenope a critical edition

Preface to the Edition.....	151
Edition .....	165

### appendices

I. Historical Notes and Sources.....	285
II. Variant Text of Manuscript V .....	333
III. Chapter Titles Added by Other Manuscript Witnesses .....	341
Bibliography .....	347
Index .....	355



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research for this project began at Villa I Tatti in 2003–2004, where it became clear that the larger study of Neapolitan civic identity I had hoped to undertake would be impossible without more sustained attention to the *Cronaca di Partenope*. I am grateful for the time afforded by that year to explore and change directions, and to the wonderful staff and friends who made the time enjoyable. Only further investigation would reveal how much revision to those early suppositions about the *Cronaca di Partenope* was necessary. That investigation began in earnest during a sabbatical year offered by Rutgers University in 2006–2007, when I was able to collect, transcribe, and collate most of the manuscript witnesses. A month at the American Academy in Rome in July 2008 gave me a chance to revisit some of the physical manuscripts directly, and the peace and quiet to work on the front matter. Even so, new discoveries, adjustments, and revisions occupied the interstices of my teaching schedule for fully two more years, a delay whose principal benefit was the opportunity to visit and impose again upon friends in France and Italy: Etienne Anheim, Catherine Brice, Rachel Donadio, Elizabeth Geoghegan, Pablo Vasquez.

Throughout my work on the *Cronaca*, I have relied on the staff of many libraries who gave me access to their collections and made reproductions of manuscripts for me: the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, the Bibliothèque nationale de France, the Biblioteche nazionali of Florence and Naples, the Società napoletana di storia patria, the Archivio di Stato of Naples, the Biblioteca Estense in Modena, the Biblioteca della regione siciliana in Palermo, the Morgan Library of New York, the Beineke Library at Yale, and the Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley. The Interlibrary Loan Department of Rutgers Library not only obtained for me several rare works, but mediated the complicated financial transaction necessary for me to acquire a microfilm of one of the manuscript copies. Martina Saltamacchia provided similar assistance in acquiring a microfilm of another Italian manuscript. The editorial board and staff of Brill Academic Publishers have been, as ever, courteous, knowledgeable, efficient, and professional, and I am delighted to be part of their Mediterranean series.

Though much of the work on this study took place in solitude, it could not have been accomplished without the aid of numerous colleagues



and friends who offered their expertise and volunteered their aid. Jean d'Amato Thomas shared with me both her knowledge of the literature on the ancient thermal baths of Campania, and printouts of manuscripts containing both her texts and mine. Fabio Troncarelli and Roberto Pesce generously offered their paleographical expertise where previous scholarly opinions had differed. Elizabeth A.R. Brown offered a physical description of a codex in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris before I was able to travel and view it myself. Andrea Berto offered encouragement out of his own editorial experience during a particularly vexing phase of manuscript collation. T. Corey Brennan helped me identify a misleading textual reference within the *Cronaca*, while Robert Lerner and David Abulafia both offered valuable bibliographical references (on the “poison legend” and the Aragonese library respectively) and comments on textual drafts. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Temma Kaplan, who allowed me to use her second home as an “office away from the office.” The perfect quiet there made the writing of this book possible, and I will not soon forget the happy hours spent on her screened porch accompanied by my canine “assistant” Poni and the sound of rustling leaves.

Stephen Pemberton has shouldered common burdens and lifted my spirits in bleak moments from the beginning of this project to its end, across five homes on two continents and through some transformative events. The greatest of those events was the arrival in March 2006 of Hugh William Kelly Pemberton, who delayed progress on this book to teach me about bugs, superheroes, and a joy I had not known possible. The seven years of this book's gestation are the seven years in which my life became joined to theirs, and as one small piece in that shared life, the book is dedicated to them.

## ABBREVIATIONS AND STYLISTIC CONVENTIONS

<i>ASPN</i>	<i>Archivio storico per le province napoletane</i>
<i>DBI</i>	<i>Dizionario biografico degli italiani</i>
<i>MGH</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i>
<i>RIS</i>	<i>Rerum italicarum scriptores</i>

To avoid confusion, I refer to chapters of the present study with a capitalized “Chapter” and the number rendered as a word, e.g. “Chapter Four.” I refer to chapters of the *Cronaca di Partenope* and of other texts found in these manuscripts with a lower-case “chapter” and arabic numerals, e.g. “chapter 6.” For classical texts, and for Giovanni Villani’s *Nuova Cronica*, I utilize the standard convention of denoting the book in Roman numerals and the chapter in arabic numerals, separated by a colon, e.g. “VII: 88.”



## PRELIMINARY MATTER



## chapter one

### INTRODUCTION

The *Cronaca di Partenope* is a history of Naples composed in the middle of the fourteenth century by a lay Neapolitan patrician named Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa. It was the first history of Naples to be written in over four hundred years, since the *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum* of the late ninth and early tenth centuries.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, it can be considered the first comprehensive history of Naples ever written, since unlike the *Gesta*, which began with Naples' first Christian bishop, the *Cronaca* began its narration in earliest antiquity and continued to the author's own present. It was, furthermore, one of the first works of any genre composed in the local Neapolitan vernacular: only two short poems of the late thirteenth century and two vernacular translations of Latin works, dated to circa 1300, precede it.<sup>2</sup>

The simultaneous revival of local historical writing and emergence of Neapolitan as a literary language attest to the major changes afoot in Naples and the surrounding region in the decades around 1300. The most important of these, and a stimulus for others, was the decision of southern Italy's new Angevin dynasty (1268–1442) to make Naples their royal capital. The heightened stature of the city, the influx of new populations drawn by the crown and by the social and economic opportunities it offered, and the cultural influences introduced by this immigration, all contributed to a certain pride in the region, its heritage, and its language. At the same time, they sparked anxiety about the loss of cherished local traditions and about the status of native Neapolitans in a greatly altered and still fluid social hierarchy. These responses found expression in several Neapolitan works of the early Trecento. A Latin liturgical compilation made for the cathedral in the 1310s included narratives regarding the cathedral's ancient origins and its links to Saint Peter and the emperor

---

<sup>1</sup> Georg Waitz, ed., *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum*, in *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et italicarum saec. VI–IX* (Hannover, 1878), 398–439.

<sup>2</sup> The poems are attributed to the so-called “abbate di Napoli;” the translations are of Peter of Eboli's *De balneis puteolarum*, originally composed circa 1200, and the *Regimen sanitatis*, a popular medical work issuing from the medical school at Salerno. See Francesco Sabatini, *Napoli angioina. Cultura e società* (Naples, 1975), 43–47.

Constantine, expressing both pride in Naples' heritage and anxiety about that heritage's loss as the cathedral complex was transformed from the 1290s forward. A Latin compilation of quotations and anecdotes about ancient Campania, composed before 1348, extended this historical interest to pagan antiquity. This same interest is evident in the earliest vernacular works in Neapolitan, which included a verse translation of Peter of Eboli's *De balneis puteolarum* of circa 1200, a description of the ancient thermal baths in the Flegrean Fields west of Naples. All these works were related to the *Cronaca di Partenope*, which borrowed heavily from the first two works for its narration and later circulated in manuscripts with a vernacular prose translation of third.<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, it is the *Cronaca* itself that scholars have frequently identified as a prime expression of the intensified communal identity of Naples in this age. Guido d'Agostino has found in the early fourteenth century "a first convincing indigenous cultural maturation utilizing a 'Neapolitan' language," of which, he argues, "the most notable product is the contemporary *Cronaca di Partenope*, a felicitous example of self-representation and more or less conscious excavation of the collective memory of a society increasingly identified with the capital city."<sup>4</sup> Giovanni Vitolo has called it a "significant witness to a burgeoning historiographical interest, which would come to circulate ever more widely, judging by the large number of manuscripts in which it survives."<sup>5</sup> As these scholars attest, the *Cronaca* was a landmark in the articulation of Neapolitan communal identity and in the development of local historiography and vernacular writing.

But the *Cronaca's* significance goes beyond its own moment. It was a foundation for the historiography of both the city and the kingdom of Naples into the seventeenth century. Within fifty years of its completion, it inspired the composition of three other histories, all deeply

---

<sup>3</sup> The liturgical compilation, known as the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio*, and the Latin compilation on classical Campania, which I refer to as "Commentary V" are discussed in Chapter Four below. On the various translations of Peter of Eboli's work, see Livio Petrucci, "Le fonti per la conoscenza della topografia delle terme Flegree dal XII al XV secolo," *ASPN* 97 (1979), 99–129. The prose translation that circulated with the *Cronaca* is known as the "Trattato dei bagni": see Chapter Six below for the manuscripts containing it.

<sup>4</sup> Guido d'Agostino, "Napoli capitale (1266–1860)," in *Storia del Mezzogiorno*, vol. 5 (Rome, 1986), 33.

<sup>5</sup> Giovanni Vitolo, *Tra Napoli e Salerno. La costruzione dell'identità cittadina nel Mezzogiorno medievale* (Salerno, 2001), 73, speaking here of the *Cronaca di Partenope* and a much briefer, contemporary Latin history of Amalfi, the *Chronicon Amalfitanum*.

indebted to the *Cronaca*, as well as a substantially redacted version of the *Cronaca* itself.<sup>6</sup> At least eight works of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth century—some amateur histories with limited circulation, some well known, published works—borrowed from the *Cronaca* for their own historical or descriptive purposes, and it engendered both a sixteenth-century Latin translation and three printed editions published in Naples in 1486–1490, 1526, and 1680.<sup>7</sup> Meanwhile, and despite the availability of these editions, the *Cronaca* continued to be copied in manuscript into the seventeenth century, with corrections, notations, and comparisons with other copies that attest to their owners' interest in the work. These manuscripts survive in rather large numbers, compared to other civic chronicles and histories composed in medieval Italy, and their transmission indicates that many more must have existed that have not survived.<sup>8</sup> Given the almost complete lack of local historiographical works for several centuries prior to the *Cronaca*, and the profusion of historiographical and historic-descriptive works indebted to it after its composition, it seems safe to say that any study of Neapolitan identity or historiography from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century must attend seriously to this work.

What shape this communal identity took in the *Cronaca*, what sources it drew on, how it envisioned the Neapolitan past and sought to integrate into that vision its new royal present, are questions that have remained unexplored. This neglect is not the result of lack of interest. Modern scholarship on the *Cronaca* began in the late nineteenth century with the distinguished southern Italian historian Bartolomeo Capasso, who featured the *Cronaca* in “Sources for the history of the Neapolitan provinces,” collected and compared manuscript copies of it, and offered hypotheses about its author, date, and source material that have remained foundational for all later studies.<sup>9</sup> From Capasso's time on, however, the *Cronaca* suffered what can only be called bad luck. Capasso himself, who

---

<sup>6</sup> See Chapter Five below at nn. 4–21.

<sup>7</sup> To the seven works mentioned in Chapter Five at n. 1 should be added the text in MS Naples, Biblioteca nazionale, X C 31 (discussed in the same chapter at n. 25) and probably Benedetto di Falco's sixteenth-century *Descrittione dei luoghi antiqui*, ed. O. Morisani (Naples, 1972).

<sup>8</sup> The extant manuscript copies, and the textual evidence suggesting the existence of more copies now lost, are discussed in Chapter Six below; on the *Cronaca*'s later influence, see Chapter Five.

<sup>9</sup> Bartolomeo Capasso, “Le fonti della storia delle provincie napoletane dal 568 al 1500,” *ASPN* 1 (1876), 592–597.



juggled a large number of scholarly projects, was unable to produce a critical edition of the work. He passed his notes to a successor, Erasmo Percopo, in the early twentieth century, who was evidently unable to proceed much further, for he published no studies on the subject. These scholars' notes then passed to Gennaro Maria Monti, whose important contributions were published in two articles of the 1930s. One article identified a significant textual source for the *Cronaca*, while the other, conceived as a prelude to his planned edition, synthesized the findings of his predecessors with his own new insights on the work.<sup>10</sup> Due to the destruction of his notes during the Second World War, however, Monti too was prevented from completing his edition. Three decades later, the project was revived by the literary scholar Antonio Altamura, who succeeded in publishing a modern edition in 1974.<sup>11</sup>

Altamura's edition has been of service to scholars in bringing attention to this text through modern publication. It was not, however, an edition capable of providing a textual foundation for sustained literary or historical analysis of the text. It does not identify a base manuscript or provide an *apparatus criticus*, leaving the authority of its readings in question. Indeed, my comparison of the manuscripts and editions suggests that it was simply a republication of the 1526 edition that devoted no serious attention to the manuscript copies. Its front matter essentially recapitulates the findings of Gennaro Maria Monti in the 1930s, when even the most basic facts about the *Cronaca* were still in doubt, and its description of manuscripts both perpetuates errors of earlier scholars and introduces new ones.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Gennaro Maria Monti, "La 'Cronaca di Partenope' (Premessa all'edizione critica)," and "Il cosiddetto 'Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio' fonte della 'Cronaca di Partenope,'" both published in idem, *Dai normanni agli aragonesi. Terza serie di studi storico-giuridici* (Trani, 1936), 31–77 and 117–145 respectively.

<sup>11</sup> Antonio Altamura, ed., *La Cronaca di Partenope* (Naples, 1974), 8–9, who explains the reasons for Monti's abandonment of the project and his own decision to undertake it.

<sup>12</sup> In the place of an *apparatus criticus*, Altamura offered brief lists of variants distinguishing the manuscript families (ed. cit., 30–32, 33–34) which I have compared to the manuscripts themselves and found to be very frequently in error. Also unreliable are the characterizations of individual manuscripts (e.g. the judgment that V is among the best witnesses) and of the relationships between them (e.g., on p. 35, that GC and V conflate the same chapters, or that VZ has no relationship to PL and E). It should also be noted that this edition ends "Part I" of the *Cronaca* with chapter 62 (chapter 60 [62B] of the present edition), though Altamura, following previous scholarship, states in the front matter (p. 27) that "Part I" contained only 57 chapters.

I first undertook serious study of the *Cronaca* in 2003, intending to employ it in a broader study of Neapolitan self-conception in the medieval and early modern period. It soon became clear, however, that the historical analysis I envisioned would not be possible until a more reliable edition of the *Cronaca* were available. Thus the study I intended (and still intend) to write has been postponed by several years as I have tackled the text itself. In the process I have gained a keen appreciation for the challenges facing my predecessors. The textual “trail” of the *Cronaca di Partenope* is extremely complex, and its early-modern editors introduced errors that led modern scholars down the wrong track with regard to the extent and authorship of the original *Cronaca*. It was necessary in effect to start from scratch, transcribing and comparing this long text, in both its versions, among all extant manuscript copies, the first edition, and what could be known about two more now-unavailable copies, in order to revise previous assumptions about the value and character of the manuscript witnesses. To identify the original version of the *Cronaca* and understand how it was redacted into the second version required sustained analysis of a different, even longer work that served as the intermediary between them, which had to be compared chapter by chapter, and often word by word, not only with both versions of the *Cronaca* but with its own principal source-text, Giovanni Villani’s *Nuova Cronica*. The other contents of the extant manuscripts, some of which remained unidentified, required review, and it was necessary to revisit scholarship dating back to the seventeenth century to understand the origins of modern scholars’ erroneous taxonomy of the text’s “parts” and to correct their consequent conclusions regarding the work’s authorship and date.

The results of this research have allowed me proffer more solid conclusions regarding the fundamental questions about the *Cronaca*: its original character, author, and date of composition, and the processes through which it was transformed into the redacted version.<sup>13</sup> Armed with this information, I have been able to identify its historical context and the way the *Cronaca* remarks upon or reacts to it. Since, like many histories,

---

<sup>13</sup> For linguistic study of the vernacular idiom employed, I refer to Francesco Sabatini on manuscript PL, and Alfonso Paoletta, who has undertaken a detailed philological analysis of five other relevant manuscripts in his edition of another work they contain. See Sabatini, *Napoli angioina*, 135, and Alfonso Paoletta, ed., *Volgarizzamento meridionale anonimo di Francesco Petrarca, ‘Itinerarium breve de Ianua usque ad Ierusalem et Terram Sanctam’* (Bologna, 1993).

the *Cronaca* relies heavily on earlier textual sources, I have undertaken sustained comparison of the text and its antecedents to illuminate what materials the author could draw upon and how he altered or preserved their accounts to fit his own vision. Finally, I have followed the “legacy” of the *Cronaca*, tracing its manuscript diffusion and influence on other works up to the publication of the first printed edition in the late fifteenth century.

This front matter is, of course, a foundation for rather than a thorough investigation of the many interpretive issues to which the *Cronaca* can contribute evidence. As a southern Italian work that focused exclusively on the city of Naples for four-fifths of its narration but closed by tracing the deeds of its monarchical rulers from the twelfth century forward, the *Cronaca* raises questions about the northern Italian communes’ monopoly on civic historiography, about the link between historiographical scope and political regime, and indeed about the utility of considering “civic” and “royal” as distinct subgenres of medieval Italian historiography.<sup>14</sup> In some ways the *Cronaca di Partenope* is comparable to Giovanni Villani’s *Nuova Cronica*, another “civic” history that devoted considerable space to monarchs on the Italian scene—so much so that, as we will see in Chapters Five and Six, Villani’s text could be excerpted and combined with the *Cronaca* to tell southern Italy’s history.

This edition, I hope, will encourage the *Cronaca*’s inclusion in comparative studies of Italian historiography and their ongoing reflection on such questions. How memory was activated and transmitted, what group identities it aimed to reinforce, and how individuals affirmed their own

---

<sup>14</sup> Giovanni Vitolo and Enrico Pispisa, while acknowledging that southern Italy’s tradition of civic historiography was far less vibrant than the north’s, have nevertheless highlighted a few examples of southern works with a strong civic focus in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries: see Vitolo, *Città e coscienza civica nel Mezzogiorno medievale (secc. IX–XIII)* (Salerno, 1990), 29–30, and Pispisa, “L’immagine della città nella storiografia meridionale del Duecento,” *Quaderni medievali* 30 (1990), 106. The link between political regime and historiographical scope (commune-civic, monarchy-royal) is often preferred to explain the difference between northern and southern Italian medieval historiography, for instance, in Ovidio Capitani, “Motivi e momenti di storiografia medioevale italiana: secc. V–XIV,” in *Nuove questioni di storia medioevale* (Milan, 1979), 785–790; Gina Fasoli, “Città e ceti urbani nell’età dei due Guglielmi,” in *Potere, società e popolo nell’età dei due Guglielmi* (Bari, 1981), 147–172; and Vitolo, *op. cit.*, 40–41. But see also Chris Wickham’s comments on early northern Italian chronicles, where local and more distant enemies appear more crucial to civic identity and writing than political leaders, a trait also characteristic of the early chapters of the *Cronaca di Partenope*: Wickham, “The Sense of the Past in Italian Communal Narratives,” in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Paul Magdalino (London, 1992), 173–189.

authority to articulate it are questions that concern students of historiography and memory generally, and to which the *Cronaca* again, as indicated in Chapters Three and Four, can offer its witness.

The *Cronaca di Partenope* is of very little use for reconstructing the events of Neapolitan history. The bulk of its narrative concerns the distant past and is heavily embroidered with legend; where it records verifiable events, it relies on textual sources that are generally superior to it in reliability. But as an instance of the articulation of communal identity through recollection of the past, it is a rich and lively source. It can tell us what Neapolitanness meant in the mid-fourteenth century, not only to this one author but to the authors of the recent sources he relied upon and to the lay patriciate he represented. It can tell us how the past was marshalled to respond to the present, and in its interweaving of textual authorities, physical objects, and local common knowledge, about the craft of remembering itself.



## chapter two

### ORIGINAL TEXT, AUTHOR AND DATE

The most basic question about the *Cronaca di Partenope* is what expanse of text should be ranged under that title.<sup>1</sup> Previous scholars, starting with Bartolomeo Capasso, have identified it as a compilation comprised of four parts. The first, “Part I,” narrates Naples’ history from its earliest Greek settlement in the eighth century bce to the tenth century (chapters 1–55 in the present edition), which Capasso attributed to an anonymous “Neapolitan enthusiast” writing circa 1326. The second begins with a list of the various lords of southern Italy and Sicily before the unification of the region under the Normans, and continues through the reigns of the Norman, Staufan, and Angevin kings of Naples until the accession of Queen Joanna I in 1343 (chapters 56 to the end of the present edition, called by previous scholars “Part II”). “Part II” concludes, in most manuscript copies, with a colophon identifying its author and dedicatee, and is sometimes called the “Breve Informazioni,” as the colophon itself refers to it. “Part III” has been identified as two long excerpts from the Florentine historian Giovanni Villani’s early-fourteenth-century *Nuova Cronica*: IIIa, the longer of the two excerpts (168 chapters), begins with the Saracen sieges of the eighth century and continues to 1325, while IIIb (59 chapters) begins with Villani’s opening chapters of universal history and proceeds to 1296. Capasso dated both excerpts to approximately the mid-fourteenth century. “Part IV,” finally, narrates a few anecdotes from the reigns of kings Charles II (1285–1309) and Robert (1309–1343) and thence moves forward in time to 1382. Capasso did not propose a date of composition for “Part IV,” but his successor G.M. Monti suggested it

---

<sup>1</sup> The title “Cronaca di Partenope” derives from the running title used in the 1526 edition, although the title page of that edition calls it “Cronache de l’inclita cita de Napole.” Where manuscript copyists offered a title or otherwise referred to the work, they generally used this title (if the copyist worked after 1526 and knew of it) or “Cronaca di Napoli,” while early-modern scholars often referred to it as the “Chronicle of the Neapolitan Villani.” Modern scholarship, however, has made “Cronaca di Partenope” too well established to merit alteration. See the brief comments on the work’s title offered by G.M. Monti, “La ‘Cronaca di Partenope’ (Premessa all’edizione critica),” in idem, *Dai normanni agli aragonesi* (Trani, 1936), 47.

was composed over the course of some years and completed in 1382.<sup>2</sup> Subsequent students of the work revised particular aspects of Capasso's description, but retained the overall identification of the work as including all these "parts."<sup>3</sup>

As is clear even from the brief descriptions just provided, these four works were certainly not all written by the same individual, nor at the same time. Parts IIIa and IIIb are largely excerpts from Giovanni Villani's *Nuova Cronica* done in the latter half of the fourteenth century. They were not necessarily excerpted by the same person, nor is there any evidence to suggest that they were created by the same author as "Part I" or "Part II." "Part IV" is also clearly a separate work, specifically a continuation of the *Cronaca* composed some thirty years later. There is no reason to continue to refer to all of these "parts" under the title "Cronaca di Partenope." As will be seen in Chapter Six, they never circulated all together in manuscript, nor did all four (or five, since Parts IIIa and IIIb are distinct) ever appear together in the printed editions.<sup>4</sup> To reflect their distinct origins, therefore, I will dispense with the nomenclature of "parts" except where referring to earlier scholarship, and utilize autonomous titles for

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>3</sup> G.M. Monti, for instance, suggested that Parts I and II might both have been authored by Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa circa 1350, though he continued to treat them as distinct. He also observed that Part IIIa made some significant, original additions to Villani's *Nuova Cronica*, all relating specifically to southern Italy. See his "La 'Cronaca,'" 31–77. Antonio Altamura did not consider the possibility of Bartolomeo's authorship of "Part I," but otherwise followed Monti's conclusions: see the front matter of his *La Cronaca di Partenope* (Naples, 1974), 26–48. Francesco Sabatini dated both Parts I and II to the mid-fourteenth century but otherwise followed Capasso's schema of four authors for the four distinct parts. He also offered his own hypothesis of their gradual union over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: see his *Napoli angioina. Cultura e società* (Naples, 1975), 133–139. A last study of the *Cronaca* is Carlachiarra Perrone's "Una probabile fonte della *Cronaca di Partenope*," *Annali della Facoltà di Magisterio dell'Università di Lecce* 1 (1970–1971), 151–162. It will not be discussed further, since it merely reproduces, with some added errors, earlier scholars' lists and description of manuscripts, and its claim to have identified a textual source for the *Cronaca* is unfounded, as was noted by Livio Petrucci, "Lasciti della prima circolazione della 'Genealogia deorum gentilium' in un manoscritto campano del Quattrocento," *Studi mediolatini e volgari* 27 (1980–1981), 163–181, at 164n.

<sup>4</sup> Indeed, previous students of the *Cronaca* tacitly acknowledged the error of treating all five "parts" as one work when they planned their actual editions. The chart of *Cronaca* chapters published by Gennaro Maria Monti as a template for his planned edition suggests that he intended to include Parts IIIa and IIIb but to exclude Part IV, perhaps because the latter was obviously composed several decades later: see his "La 'Cronaca,'" 64–77. Antonio Altamura, by contrast (ed. cit.), excluded Parts IIIa and IIIb, since they are principally excerpts of Villani's work, but included Part IV.

each that reflect their contents. Part IIIa I call the “Southernized Villani” or “SV,” for it was not in fact a verbatim excerpt of Villani’s *Nuova Cronica* but one to which considerable additions and omissions were made that heighten its focus on southern Italy. Part IIIb I call the “Universal Villani Excerpt” or “UV,” since it begins with the opening chapters of Villani that address universal history. Part IV I call the “Later Angevin Chronicle” since it is a continuation of the *Cronaca di Partenope* that focuses on Naples’ Angevin rulers in the later fourteenth century.<sup>5</sup>

The thornier question is whether “Part I” and “Part II” should be considered two works, composed by separate authors possibly at different times, or a single work. As was mentioned above, “Part II” concludes, in most manuscript copies, with a colophon identifying its author. The central questions, therefore, are two. Are the witnesses featuring the colophon reliable, and should the information they offer be related to “Part II” alone, or to the whole preceding text?

To assess the colophon’s reliability we must briefly recapitulate the manuscript evidence, which is analyzed in detail in Chapter Six below. As that evidence attests, two versions of the *Cronaca* circulated by the end of the fourteenth century: the original, which comprised seventy-five chapters, and a redacted version done in the next few decades, which runs to ninety-six chapters. The redacted or “B” version altered the original text in many places but is most notable for substituting, in its final chapters, the longer account of Naples’ monarchs offered by the “Southernized Villani” in place of the original *Cronaca*’s terser version. Often the two versions’ narratives are very similar, though their chapter numeration diverges (in which cases I offer the B version’s numeration in parentheses: e.g. chapter 20 [21B]); where they no longer closely correspond, I refer to them separately or with a slash, e.g. chapter 63A/69B. For present purposes, the important point is that the only manuscript witnesses to omit the colophon are those of the B version, which is certainly not original, and one other, Vaticanus Latinus 4601 (= V), whose copy of “Part II” is mutilated and does not reach the end of the work. In other words, all copies of the original version of “Part II” that could be expected to contain the colophon do indeed contain it. For “Part II,” at least, the colophon must be considered reliable evidence.

---

<sup>5</sup> Its date of composition and status as a continuation of the *Cronaca* are discussed in Chapter Five below.



Our decision about whether this colophon applies to the entire previous text or only to “Part II” will be aided by what we learn from it about the identified author and the date at which he worked. It reads, *La sopra-dicta breve informacione tracta de diverse croniche ve fay a vuy nostro signore re Luyse lo vostro fidelissimo vassallo Bartholomeo Caraczulo dicto Carrafa cavaliere de Napoli* (“The aforesaid brief information, drawn from various chronicles, your most faithful vassal Bartolomeo Caracciolo called ‘Carafa,’ knight of Naples, has done for you, our lord king Louis”). Our author is therefore Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa (d. 1362), to whose biography we will turn in a moment. The “king Louis” to whom he dedicated the work is Louis of Taranto, second husband of Queen Joanna I, whose reign allows us narrow down the date of the *Cronaca*’s completion. The start of Louis’ rule is somewhat ambiguous. After the murder of Joanna’s first husband, Andrew of Hungary, in 1345, her cousin Robert of Taranto first exercised influence over the young queen, but by October 1346 Joanna had attached herself instead to his brother Louis. They were married in Naples in August 1347. Both Joanna and Louis fled to Provence in early 1348 and obtained papal authorization of their marriage. Upon their joint return in August 1348, Louis had all royal documents for the kingdom issued in both their names, but only in 1352 did the pope officially recognize Louis as king and co-ruler.<sup>6</sup> G.M. Monti has given the date 1347 as the start of Louis’ reign, and hence as the *terminus post quem* for the completion of the *Cronaca* (or at least of “Part II”).<sup>7</sup> Certainly Louis was Joanna’s husband by the middle of that year, but, as one local fourteenth-century chronicle noted, the marriage had been contracted without papal authorization.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, Louis was absent from the kingdom for much of the 1348 and under scrutiny for possible involvement in Andrew’s murder. It seems unlikely, therefore, that a

---

<sup>6</sup> For the history of these years, see É. Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples* (Paris, 1954), 347–361, 365. The marriage of Joanna and Louis in August 1347 is attested in the Florentine chronicler Giovanni Villani’s *Nuova Cronica* at XII: 99 (ed. Giuseppe Porta [Parma, 1990–1991]).

<sup>7</sup> Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 52.

<sup>8</sup> The “Later Angevin Chronicle,” narrating the return of Louis and Joanna from Avignon in 1348, speaks of Louis simply as “the illustrious lord Louis of Taranto,” and while calling him Joanna’s “legitimate husband,” also notes that Joanna “had taken him for her husband without the dispensation of the holy Roman Church.” See the chapter numbered 105 in the first edition of the *Cronaca di Partenope* (where the “Later Angevin Chronicle” is considered part of the *Cronaca*), and the modern edition by Antonio Altamura, *La Cronaca di Partenope* (Naples, 1974), at 151. For a fuller discussion of this work see Chapter Five below.

Neapolitan would have considered him already king in the year following the marriage. It is likely, however, that a Neapolitan would have considered him king by the time he had returned to Naples, was clearly in control of royal military forces, and was issuing royal documents in his own and Joanna's name—in other words, by late summer 1348—and would not have felt the need to await the pope's official recognition nearly four years later.<sup>9</sup> Thus August 1348 seems a reasonable *terminus post quem* for the *Cronaca's* dedication to Louis. A *terminus ante quem* of May 1362 is indisputable, for Louis died on the 24th of that month, and Bartolomeo himself died later in the same year. The inscription on Bartolomeo's tomb in the church of San Domenico, now destroyed, read, "Hic iacet corpus domini Bartholomaei Caraczuli dicti Carrafae de Neapoli militis Magnae Regiae Reginalisque Curiae Magistri Rationalis qui obiit anno Domini MCCCCLXII."<sup>10</sup>

A more precise dating may be possible thanks to a comment made in chapter 72A, which identifies the eldest daughter of Charles II as married to Charles of Valois, "father of king Philip who is living now." The "Philip" identified here is clearly Philip VI of France, who ruled from 1328 until his death in August 1350. Only three manuscripts, however, have this reading: P1, M1, and GC. The other manuscripts of the original, "A" version similarly describe Charles of Valois as father of king Philip but omit the final phrase "who is living now" (*che è ne mo*). The Group B manuscripts—here following their source, the "Southernized Villani"—instead describe Charles of Valois, incorrectly, as "firstborn son of the king of France who was called Philip the Fair." (Charles of Valois was the younger brother, not son, of Philip IV "the Fair.") Although the phrase *che è ne mo* occurs in a minority of extant manuscript copies, it is very likely original. The three manuscript copies in which it appears are relatively reliable. All belong to the original, Group A version of the *Cronaca*; P1 and M1 are our earliest surviving copies from that family; and GC, though late, generally hews very closely to M1 in its readings. If

<sup>9</sup> In the chapter immediately following that mentioned in the last note, the "Later Angevin Chronicle" begins to narrate Louis' leadership of military forces against the king of Hungary, and now calls Louis "king": loc. cit. in the first edition of 1486–1490, and in the edition of Altamura at 152.

<sup>10</sup> The epitaph is cited in Monti, "La 'Cronaca,'" 52n, and in Altamura, ed., *La Cronaca*, 38n. Both cite Cesare d'Engenio Caracciolo, *Napoli sacra* (Naples, 1623), 383, but give different versions of the epitaph's conclusion. Altamura gives "die Mercuri 7 ind. mensis decembris." Monti gives only "die Mercurii 7 ind.," noting that Bartolomeo Capasso had corrected (or corrected to?) "mensis decembris." Thus either 'die mercurii' or 'mensis decembris' is incorrect: the epitaph did not contain both.

other Group A manuscripts omitted the phrase *che ène mo*, this is easily explained by the fact that at the time they were copied Philip VI was no longer living. By the same logic, there was no reason for any copyist after 1350 to add this phrase, again suggesting it is original. Finally, the fact that the alternate reading, identifying Philip as Philip the Fair, derives from the “Southernized Villani” suffices to indicate that it is a later alteration. Accepting that the description of Philip VI as “living now” is original, it must have been penned in or before August 1350. Our time window for the work’s composition, or at least its completion, can therefore be narrowed to the months between August 1348 and August 1350.

Having established that Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa completed “Part II” between 1348 and 1350, let us return to the question of the relationship between “Part II” and “Part I.” Bartolomeo Capasso, father of modern scholarship on the *Cronaca*, did not explain in his published work his reasons for assuming that these “parts” were separate, but we can follow some clues in later scholars’ observations. The first piece of evidence was put forward by Gennaro Maria Monti, who inherited the notes of Capasso and of Capasso’s editorial successor, Erasmo Percopo. Monti observed that “Part II” begins, at chapter 56, with the phrase *Poi de questo è da sapere*, which, he argued, “resembles the beginning of Part IIIb, *Poi troviamo per la istoria de la Bibbia*.” Since Part IIIb, what I call the “Universal Villani Excerpt,” is the beginning of a new text—the cited line opens Giovanni Villani’s *Nuova Cronica*—the similar initial phrase of chapter 56 presumably proved it, too, to be the beginning of a work.<sup>11</sup> On its own this is a weak argument for dividing the *Cronaca* into two parts. Changes of subject within a work were often marked by such segues. Chapter 44 (46B) of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, for instance, begins with a similar segue, *Non è iusto anche lassare in silencio . . .* This chapter appears not only in the middle of “Part I,” but in the middle of several chapters borrowed directly from a single source. Similarly, the first chapter of the “Southernized Villani” begins *Et ne pare convenebele cosa . . .*, but in Villani’s *Nuova Cronica*, from which this was taken, it opens Book III, chapter 8, neither a new work nor even a new book of Villani’s chronicle.

---

<sup>11</sup> The phrase from Villani opens Book I, chapter 2, but chapter 1 is a prologue, such that this chapter is the beginning of the narration proper. In Villani this chapter begins “*Noi troviamo*,” not “*Poi troviamo*.”

Although Capasso did not offer it as a proof of separate authorship, it is possible that his assumption was influenced by his dating of “Part I” twenty years earlier than “Part II.” This dating is based on internal evidence. In chapter 19 (20B), the *Cronaca* states that a certain metal horse was melted down and made into Naples’ cathedral bell in 1322. Chapter 27 (28B) again offers a specific date: in 1326, it recounts, the tomb of Virgil was “whole and sound.” For Capasso, mention of these dates signified that the text must have been composed immediately afterward. In the opinion of Capasso and Monti, further proof of such a dating was supplied by the reference to King Robert in chapter 6. Here the *Cronaca* states that a Greek temple inscription was translated by “master Niccolò da Reggio, Greek physician of the illustrious King Robert,” which indicated to these scholars that Robert, who died in January 1343, was still living.

Two comments are in order regarding this argument. First, it is not impossible that Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa composed his text over a number of years, starting perhaps in the later 1320s and finishing between 1348 and 1350. The evidence suggesting composition of early chapters in the 1320s therefore does not preclude Bartolomeo’s authorship. Second, the three references above do not necessarily indicate that those chapters were written in the 1320s, or even in Robert’s reign. Robert is not described as still living or ruling, and simple mention of his name does not imply he was alive. Furthermore, if the author of “Part I” were writing in or soon after 1326, one would expect him to write that Virgil’s tomb “still exists now,” a phrase he employs frequently when he refers to the present. The inclusion of a specific date here seems to signal not its proximity in time to the author’s present, but its distance. The author did not know if Virgil’s tomb was still intact at the time of writing; presumably he had not visited it or heard tale of it from others in recent years; but he could affirm its existence in the not-too-distant past, in a year he could still remember. All told, these references in “Part I” suggest a date of composition closer to 1348 than to 1326, and therefore accord better with Bartolomeo’s known date of completion of the work. But even if they were composed earlier, they do not disqualify Bartolomeo as their author.

One final reference must be mentioned in regard to dating: in chapter 26 (27B), the *Cronaca* speaks of jousts held in Naples “before the year 1380.” The date 1380 is found in almost all manuscripts; P1 gives the date instead as 1480, although this manuscript was copied long before that year. The date 1380 obviously contradicts all other indices of the *Cronaca*’s composition. If “Part I” were written in or after 1380, it cannot have been penned by Bartolomeo, who died in 1362, much less by

an author writing twenty years earlier; and no one has entertained the possibility that “Part I” was written three decades or more after “Part II.” Despite its appearance in virtually all manuscript copies, this date must be a scribal error. Nor is it difficult to imagine how it occurred. In manuscript N<sub>1</sub>, the date 1380 is written as *M et ccc lxxx*, where the *et*, in a common medieval abbreviation, is a single stroke with serifs top and bottom similar to, though shorter than, a lower-case “l.” Thus in the date *M ccc et xxx* (i.e., 1330) it would be easy to mistake the *et* for an “l” and end up with *M ccc l xxx* (1380). This error must have occurred early in the text’s transmission to be found in virtually all extant manuscripts. But it must have occurred.

Though not proffered as arguments for double authorship by any previous scholar, there are two other pieces of evidence that seem to support the idea. The first is that “Part II” is reported to appear alone in three manuscript copies: SN<sub>3</sub>, N<sub>4</sub>, and an unidentified manuscript in Vienna (VI). Although all these copies are quite late, dating to the later sixteenth century at the earliest, any independent circulation of “Part II” must be taken seriously as a possible index of separate composition. However, as noted in Chapters Five and Six below, neither SN<sub>3</sub> nor N<sub>4</sub> is a copy of “Part II.” Both are substantial reworkings of the *Cronaca*, which copy some of its passages and then extend the history up to the copyists’ own time. Furthermore, the *Cronaca* passages they copy do not come exclusively from “Part II.” Instead they open with a short account of Constantine’s Donation, found in the *Cronaca* at chapter 40 (41B) and hence in “Part I.” As for VI, it was believed to be a copy of N<sub>4</sub>; even if it were possible to locate this manuscript, therefore, it would not change the evidence just offered. Far from supporting the notion of the independent circulation of “Part II” (and hence possibly of its independent composition), these texts suggest the opposite.

A second unstated but plausible argument for separate authorship is the different narrative focus and organization of the *Cronaca*’s later chapters. Through chapter 55 (57B), the city of Naples is the indisputable protagonist of the narration. Events beyond Naples are barely mentioned; only occasionally is chronology specified through identification of the current pope or emperor; and the leaders of Naples itself (bishops or dukes) appear rarely and only as an aside. From chapter 56, however—the beginning of “Part II”—the leaders and, later, kings of southern Italy are the engine and center of the story. The narration is chronologically continuous and organized by reign, and the kings’ exploits are recounted even when they occur far from Naples. Indeed, references to Naples are

sometimes (as in the chapters on Robert Guiscard) extremely scant. This is a significant difference. In the absence of any other indications of separate authorship, however, it would be an error to apply modern notions of narrative coherence to a medieval text and assert, on that basis alone, that single authorship is impossible.

Much of the evidence in favor of a single author and date has been touched upon above, but it is well to rehearse it explicitly. The strongest indication of the unity of the text is the integral transmission of “Part I” and “Part II.” No manuscript contains chapters 1–55 (57B) alone. No manuscript contains chapters 56 (58B) to the end alone. No edition published just one “part” or the other. Later texts that borrowed from the *Cronaca* borrowed principally from chapters 56 (58B) forward, but included information found in an earlier chapter as well, indicating that their source text included both parts. Furthermore, no manuscript gives any visual cue of a break between chapters 55 and 56, or indeed at any other point before Bartolomeo’s colophon: no blank space to start chapter 56 on a new folio, no new title, larger initial, flourish, or “Deo gratias. Amen.”

Secondly, the internal dating evidence does not preclude single authorship and tends rather to support it. Bartolomeo may have started his composition, or his collection of documents and texts, as early as the late 1320s or 1330s. He may have composed the entire history in the two-year window in which we know he finished it. But in either case all indices in the text are consonant with a completion between 1348 and 1350, and hence with Bartolomeo’s authorship.

Third, despite the different narrative focus of the royal chapters—a difference at least partly attributable to the obviously different conditions of Neapolitan history once incorporated into a kingdom, and to the monarch-centered character of the source(s) upon which the *Cronaca* drew—internal evidence overall supports unitary composition. Early chapters mention later-medieval kings of southern Italy, including Roger II and Charles I, and explain that these personages will be treated in more detail later. Thus the author of the early chapters planned to continue his narration to the Angevin era at least, and not to end, as “Part I” does, in the tenth century. Francesco Sabatini suggested that these comments were added to the text when Parts “I” and “II” were combined sometime in the later fourteenth century.<sup>12</sup> This hypothesis, for which

---

<sup>12</sup> Sabatini, *Napoli angioina*, 134.

there is no textual evidence, seems to be the product of Sabatini's effort to square the notion of double authorship with internal evidence contradicting it. It adds another layer of complexity to explain what is much more easily explained by a single author.

Fourth, the interests, level of education, and social origin of the author of "Part I" correspond to that of "Part II." In other words, if we had to reconstruct the identity of the author of "Part I," we would end up with a portrait very similar to that of Bartolomeo. He was a native Neapolitan. Probably he was lay, given his choice to write in the vernacular, but a layman with a solid grounding in Latin, the language of all his textual sources. He might indeed have been a cleric, for he had access to the liturgical documents of the cathedral (as we shall see in Chapter Four below); if not, he was certainly close to members of the local ecclesiastical hierarchy who had access to church documents, and felt strong attachments himself to certain local churches. In either case, he was certainly a member of the urban patriciate, for he is careful to emphasize the glorious and ancient history of Naples' neighborhood associations (known as *seggi*), and indeed to distinguish the most ancient and noble from newer ones. All this, as we will see in a moment, describes Bartolomeo very well.

Given the scant evidence for two authors of the *Cronaca* and the strong evidence for one, it is striking that such a distinguished scholar as Bartolomeo Capasso chose the former. Indeed, the whole subject is oddly treated, for while establishing a text's authorship and date is among the first duties of an editor, Capasso's published work offered no explanation of his reasoning. Nor do his private notes seem to have included a sustained analysis of the question, for Gennaro Maria Monti, in adumbrating Capasso's research, could mention little more. Both scholars give the impression of communicating an already established fact. And indeed, the origins of the double-author idea can be found if we look back to the scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth century. In their efforts to reconstruct the history of Naples, its churches, and its early historians, scholars such as Giovanni Antonio Summonte, Bartolomeo Chioccarelli, and Alessio Simmaco Mazzocchi consulted the *Cronaca*, which was available in several printed editions.<sup>13</sup> These editions all proclaim

---

<sup>13</sup> A review of previous scholarship on the *Cronaca*'s author is provided by Francescantonio Soria, *Memorie storico-critiche degli storici napoletani*, 2 vols. (Naples, 1782), vol. 2, 643–646. The works referred to above are Summonte's *Historia della città e regno di Napoli* of 1601, Chioccarelli's *Antistitum praeclarissimae neapolitanae ecclesiae catalogus* of 1643, and Mazzocchi's later work on the Neapolitan Church, the *Dissertatio historica de cathedralis ecclesiae neapolitanae* of 1751; all published in Naples.

Giovanni Villani to be the author, and with a not uncommon deference to the authority of printed text, they accepted this attribution as true. Indeed, some devoted considerable energy to tracking down a fourteenth-century Neapolitan named Giovanni Villani and to making his dates accord with the evidence of the *Cronaca*.<sup>14</sup> Other scholars, however, consulted manuscript copies of the text rather than printed editions. Here they found the colophon identifying Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa, not Villani, as the author. One solution to this situation, supported by Francescantonio Soria in his historiographical dictionary of 1782, was to consider the “Neapolitan Villani” the initiator of the *Cronaca* and Bartolomeo its continuator.<sup>15</sup> Capasso, who regularly cited Soria’s work, doubtless encountered the idea of two authors here, but rejecting the attribution of “Part I” to a Neapolitan named Giovanni Villani, which he knew to be an error, he described it simply as anonymous.

As the history of this idea makes clear, the theory of double authorship grew out of the misattribution of the text to Villani in the printed editions, and out of the efforts of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century scholars to reconcile this with the manuscript evidence. Given that the idea of two separate authors originated with an error, that no evidence strongly supports it, and that much evidence contradicts it, we must assume that Parts “I” and “II” were a single text—the *Cronaca di Partenope*—composed by Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa and completed between the summer of 1348 and the summer of 1350.

### *Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa and his Family*

Let us turn now to our author, Bartolomeo Caracciolo *detto* Carafa. He belonged to one of the largest and most important clans of Naples’ urban patriciate, the Caracciolo, whose members had held prestigious municipal and ecclesiastical offices for centuries. The many branches of the family and the tendency to re-use the same given names make it difficult to know the exact relationship between our Bartolomeo and the many other

---

<sup>14</sup> Giovanni Antonio Summonte seems to have been the first to suggest that the tomb epitaph of one *Io[hannes] Rumbus dictus Villanus* located in the Neapolitan church of San Domenico referred to the *Cronaca*’s author. Others observed that the *Cronaca* (as it appeared in the printed editions, i.e. including the “Later Angevin Chronicle”) continued to 1380, and therefore averred that this Giovanni Rumbo Villani lived until 1380 or 1390: see the summary by Soria, cited in the previous note.

<sup>15</sup> Soria was not the first to suggest this solution, but seems to have done much to establish it: see *ibid.*, 644.



Caracciolo who appear in the records of late-medieval Naples. The different branches of this large clan adopted cognomens in the thirteenth century—"Rosso" is attested from the mid-thirteenth century, although "Carafa" seems to have first applied to our author's father closer to 1300—but they were not consistently used in documents even in the fourteenth century.<sup>16</sup> (By the later fifteenth century some branches were known only by these additional cognomens, as was the case with the Carafa.) A few examples of the Caracciolo family's careers from the first half of the fourteenth century illustrate their ubiquity in Neapolitan civic and ecclesiastical offices and their service to the crown. One Roberto Caracciolo was a *secretus*, or fiscal representative of the crown, in the provinces of Principato and Terra di Lavoro in 1305; he is probably the same Roberto named as a judge of the royal court in 1309.<sup>17</sup> Giovanni Caracciolo, of the Rosso branch of the family, was one of Naples' six *eletti* or civic magistrates in June 1327; in this role he, along with his relative and fellow *eletto* Landolfo Caracciolo-Rosso, negotiated with a Florentine entrepreneur hoping to build a cloth factory in Naples.<sup>18</sup> Patrician families also sought to place their members in important local ecclesiastical posts, and the Caracciolo were no exception. Giovanni was deacon and cantor of the cathedral in 1311–1312.<sup>19</sup> Marino was a subdeacon of the cathedral in 1323, but already enjoyed an influential position from 1319, when he was the vicar general of archbishop Hubert d'Ormont and a participant in the canonization proceedings for Thomas Aquinas. Marino was followed in his post as subdeacon by Pietro Caracciolo, attested in 1335.<sup>20</sup> Marino or Pietro could well have given our author access to the cathedral's recent liturgical compilation, the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio*, which became a very important textual source for the *Cronaca di Partenope*.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> On the use of the cognomen "Rosso" by one of the oldest branches of the Caracciolo family already in the thirteenth century, see N. Kamp, "Caracciolo, Bernardo," and L. Miglio, "Caracciolo, Enrico," in *DBI*, vol. 19 (Rome, 1976), 317–319 and 349–351 respectively.

<sup>17</sup> Sigismundo Sicola, *Primus elenchus nonnullarum illustrium familiarum ... ex regali archivio Magne Curie Regis* (unpublished manuscript, 1686), 803, 543.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 992, 642.

<sup>19</sup> Carlo Borelli, *Repertorium universale familiarum et terrarum existentium in Regestris realis* (unpublished manuscript, 1706), 304.

<sup>20</sup> On Marino and Pietro, see Pasquale Santamaria, *Historia collegii Patrum Canoniarum metropolitanae ecclesiae Neapolitanae* (Naples, 1900), 397, 510.

<sup>21</sup> On this compilation and its relationship to the *Cronaca* see Chapter Four below.

Closer to home, we find three men active in Naples in the early Trecento who bore the name Bartolomeo Caracciolo *detto* Carafa, and their biographies have often been confused. The man who served as justiciar and procurator for the royal prince Peter of Anjou in 1307–1309 was almost certainly our author's eponymous father, married, according to Gennaro Maria Monti, to Teodora del Gaudio of Sessa. Carlo de Frede has noted that he received a royal pension as an "old man" in 1330. It is likely, therefore, that offices held by a Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa before 1330 refer to Bartolomeo *père*. In 1324 he served as witness to the will of King Robert's most important government minister, Bartolomeo da Capua; in 1328, as executor of the will of King Robert's only son, Charles of Calabria; and it may be he who served as one of Naples' six *eletti* in 1330, if his retirement came at the end of that year.<sup>22</sup>

After 1330 we can be sure that historical notices do not refer to our author's father, by now retired from public life. Still, our Bartolomeo's biography is far from clear, for different scholars offer quite different lists of offices and involvements. According to G.M. Monti, he was a representative of the *seggio* of Nido in the parliament convened by King Robert in 1332; provincial justiciar of Basilicata in 1333; chamberlain of the young prince Andrew of Hungary (then betrothed to the future Joanna I) in 1334; witness to a royal treaty with some northern Italian cities and lords in 1341; representative of the *seggio* of Nido in Naples' municipal government again in 1350; witness to the will of one Bartolomeo da Besanto in 1352; and from 1343 until 1362, *magister rationalis* of the royal treasury.<sup>23</sup> Carlo de Frede, in a more recent review of the evidence, agrees on Bartolomeo's role as representative of Nido in the royal parliament of 1332, and on his witnessing the treaty of 1341, probably again as a civic representative. Otherwise he affirms only Bartolomeo's post in the royal treasury, to which he was first named in November 1343 and confirmed in 1344. He mentions, however, what he considers an "improbable" story related by the modern historian Émile Léonard: that Bartolomeo was involved in the assassination of Andrew of Hungary in 1345 and "seems,

---

<sup>22</sup> Monti, "La 'Cronaca,'" 51–53, who however attributes the offices of Bartolomeo *père* to our author, giving him an impossibly long career. The service as executor of Charles of Calabria's will he dates to 1338, but this must be a typographical error for 1328, year of Charles' death, which would place it in the sphere of activity of our author's father. Father and son are distinguished in Carlo de Frede, "Caracciolo, Bartolomeo, detto Carafa," in *DBI*, vol. 19 (Rome, 1976), 312–313. On municipal service in 1330, see Borelli, *Repertorium*, 188.

<sup>23</sup> Monti, "La 'Cronaca,'" loc. cit. (see previous note).

anyway, to have been denounced on 6 March 1346 and, after his arrest, to have escaped and thus avoided execution.” By January 1348, during the Hungarian invasion of southern Italy, he was again serving in the municipal government along with seven other men. All agree that he died in December 1362 and was buried in the Dominican church of San Domenico.<sup>24</sup>

Accepting only the correspondences between these two biographies, it is safe to say that Bartolomeo was a principal representative of the *seggio* of Nido and an active participant in city government, and that he held a mid-level royal office, in the treasury, for the last twenty years of his life. His service to Andrew of Hungary should also be accepted, for it was mentioned again in relation to the career of his son, as we shall see in a moment. Given his continued service in the royal treasury, however, a prominent role in Andrew’s assassination and necessity to escape capture seems, as Carlo de Frede averred, improbable.

The third Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa was our author’s son. His modern biography describes him as the son of a Bartolomeo, “royal counselor,” and of Mabilia di Montefalcione (who was therefore our author’s wife). King Robert promised him a canonry in Bari in 1325; whether he received the post is uncertain, but by 1334 he was a professor of civil law in the Neapolitan *studium* and chaplain to the king. In 1337, “for the services rendered by his father to Andrew of Hungary,” he was given the revenue of the chapel of Santa Lucia di Somma, a royal church not far from Naples. In May 1347 he became archbishop of Bari, and helped defend the city against the invasion of the king of Hungary. He died on 16 March 1367, less than five years after his father.<sup>25</sup> Bartolomeo *clericus* has also frequently been confused with our author, and only relatively recent findings allow us to collate the evidence on their careers and draw out its significance.<sup>26</sup> Most notably, the evidence that Bartolomeo *clericus* received the revenue from S. Lucia thanks to his father’s service to Andrew of Hungary corroborates Monti’s claim that

<sup>24</sup> De Frede, “Caracciolo, Bartolomeo, detto Carafa,” 312–313.

<sup>25</sup> See the entry by R. Capasso in *DBI*, vol. 19 (Rome, 1976), 494.

<sup>26</sup> Soria, *Memorie storico-critiche*, vol. 2, 644, attributes the rectorship of S. Lucia to our author; G.M. Monti, “L’età angioina,” in *Storia della Università di Napoli* (Naples, 1924; repr. 1993), 128–129, also conflates Bartolomeo the historian with Bartolomeo the archbishop. He corrected this in “La ‘Cronaca,’” 52, but without discussing the career of our author’s son. R. Capasso’s recent biographical entry on Bartolomeo *clericus* in the *DBI* does not note the identity of his father as the author of the *Cronaca*, though he does add to knowledge of our author by noting his title as royal counselor and by identifying his wife.

our author was the prince's chamberlain in the earlier 1330s. The son's ties to the church of S. Lucia di Somma may also explain our author's curious preoccupation, in the *Cronaca*, with veneration of Saint Lucy in the Neapolitan church of San Giovanni Maggiore. He insists that the church was in fact dedicated to both saints, and that each had his or her own altar and image in the church "so that it be clear to everyone that in this church the dedication is to Lucy as to John, and to John as to Lucy; and there are as many indulgences when it is [the feast of] Saint Lucy in the month of December as when it is [the feast of] Saint John in the month of June; and in ancient times there were crowds for the feast of one as for the feast of the other." I know of no other medieval or early-modern work that refers to this church as SS. Giovanni e Lucia, nor of any modern scholar who discusses it as dedicated to both: it appears to have been a preoccupation of Bartolomeo himself. And while his own devotional choices alone might explain it, his son's association with a church dedicated to the same Saint Lucy may well have given an added impetus to this unique description of one of Naples' major basilicas. A similar paternal attachment may explain Bartolomeo's small addition to his translation of Valerius Maximus in chapter 10, where he specifies that the territorial dispute between Naples and Nola concerned Somma (location of the church with which his son was affiliated), and uses the dispute to explain the site's name as the "summit" of Neapolitan-Nolan conflict.

If we look more broadly at the younger generation of Caracciolo making their careers in the 1340s, we might also find pressing reasons for Bartolomeo to dedicate his work to the new king, Louis of Taranto. In 1346, after the murder of her husband Andrew and the execution of her favorite Roberto de' Cabanni, Joanna "consoled herself" with the young Neapolitan Enrico Caracciolo-Rosso, whom she named grand chamberlain of the realm in 1347. Enrico was thus a rival to Louis of Taranto, still no more than "husband and expectant king." In 1348 Joanna fled with Enrico to Provence, leaving Louis behind, and interceded on Enrico's behalf to prevent his prosecution for involvement in Andrew's murder. When the royal court returned to Naples in August 1348, Louis declared himself king, but was still only co-ruler: Joanna's power was demonstrated by the retention of Enrico as grand chamberlain and the appointment in March 1349 of another Caracciolo, Landulfo, as protonotary of the realm. The turbulence caused by the invasion of the king of Hungary, however, quickly allowed Louis of Taranto to consolidate his control over royal affairs, and among his first acts was to strike down Joanna's

favorite. He arrested Enrico for adultery in April 1349, gave his confiscated possessions to his advisor Niccolò Acciaiuoli, and very likely had Enrico executed shortly thereafter, since Enrico then disappears from the historical record. The attempted revenge by Enrico's brother Filippo, who shot an arrow at Acciaiuoli in piazza Capuana in June 1350, only consolidated the Caracciolo's identification as clients of the queen and antagonists of Louis and Niccolò Acciaiuoli. In such circumstances Bartolomeo may well have judged it expedient to illustrate his loyalty to Louis, whose control by summer 1349 was so absolute that the pope accused him of treating the queen as a prisoner and servant.<sup>27</sup>

If the *Cronaca* was dedicated to Louis, however, that does not necessarily mean it was written with him in mind, nor that it was conceived and entirely composed in the tumultuous years between 1348 and 1350. In assessing its contents, it is well to keep in mind the full scope of Bartolomeo's career. He was a royal official and the son of a royal official, but he was also an important representative of his city, and within the city the particular representative of his own patrician *seggio*. At the same time he was tied by extensive family connections to the ecclesiastical community of Naples. These affiliations competed as well as coincided, and account for some of the complexity of the *Cronaca*'s vision of the history of his chosen subject, "the city of Naples." To more fully grasp the context that shaped our author and his views, we must look beyond his own career, too, to the broader historical developments at work in his lifetime.

---

<sup>27</sup> É. Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples*, 350–362; see also L. Miglio, "Caracciolo, Enrico," 349–351. The descriptions offered in quotation marks are from Léonard, loc. cit.

## chapter three

### HISTORICAL CONTEXT

In Bartolomeo's time, the most notable event in recent Neapolitan history was the city's elevation to the status of royal capital by the realm's new conquerors, the Angevin dynasty. Charles I of Anjou had defeated his last Staufen rival, Conradin, in 1268, and settled on Naples as the seat of his government, probably for greater proximity to his county of Provence and to his papal and northern Italian allies. Whether this was a temporary measure dictated by the fragility of Charles' new rule or would be a permanent decision was not necessarily clear until 1282, when Sicily's rebellion, and its embrace of a rival Aragonese prince as ruler, made the traditional royal seat, Palermo, inaccessible. Even so, with the capture of the heir to the throne in 1284 and the death of Charles himself in 1285—his son, now Charles II, remaining a prisoner of his Aragonese rivals until 1289—the longevity of Angevin rule itself was in doubt. Thus only with Charles II's return to Naples, and especially with his commencement in the 1290s of massive building projects in the city, was Naples clearly the permanent capital of a secure ruling house. Given that Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa died in 1362, it is likely he was born in the years around 1300. His whole life, therefore, was lived against the background of Naples' transformation into a royal city and international capital.

The changes wrought by the Angevin presence in Naples can be grouped into four principal, if overlapping, categories: social, political, urbanistic, and cultural. Each undoubtedly shaped Bartolomeo's experience and his outlook on the city whose history he undertook. Each is reflected in the *Cronaca* in ways that make a fairly detailed portrait of the civic context helpful in interpreting his work. What follows draws together the excellent studies published on various aspects of Naples' urban history in this age, filling in where necessary with recourse to data collected by prewar scholars from the now-destroyed Angevin royal archives, to sketch in this background as it most directly pertains to Bartolomeo's life and text.

*The Social Landscape*

Of the various changes ushered in by Naples' new status, the most immediate and perhaps most profound was a social one: the influx of new populations to the capital. Already in 1272—before the Angevins' large building projects were underway, and before their reforms of the civic government—a royal document could speak of the presence in Naples of “innumerable multitudes of foreign merchants (*mercatorum exterio- rum*) and others in the train of the royal court.”<sup>1</sup> As that statement indicates, the royal government itself was a major cause of this immigration. Accompanying Charles I in his conquest of the realm was a sizeable population of Frenchmen and Provençals, who were not only enfeoffed with feudal lands throughout the kingdom but populated the capital as well, as officials of the administrative bureaux located in various structures in the city and as members of the royal household. The other conspicuous community of foreigners mentioned in 1272 was that of foreign merchants, attracted by Naples' greater importance as a port and market and by the crown's frequent need for ships and loans. Communities from Pisa, Genoa, and the Amalfi coast, established in the city before the Angevin conquest, grew in size, and were now joined by others, including Marseillais, Catalans, northern French, and especially Florentines, whose banking services were crucial to crown finances and whose political ties to the Angevins were particularly close. Each community had its own loggia and often its own “national” church along the coast.<sup>2</sup> Families from other coastal areas of Campania also moved to Naples, often making their careers in maritime service to the crown and usually settling in port neighborhoods (the *seggi* of Porto and Portanova) that Bartolomeo would disparage in his work.<sup>3</sup> Boccaccio, who spent thirteen years of his youth in Naples in the 1320s and 1330s, gives us a glimpse of the bustling harbor as a neighborhood of strongmen and tricksters, such as the Sicilian “cousin” who relieved an ingenuous Perugian merchant of his

---

<sup>1</sup> Cited in Carlo de Frede, “Da Carlo I d'Angiò a Giovanna I,” in *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 3 (Naples, 1969), 55.

<sup>2</sup> Arnaldo Venditti, “Urbanistica e architettura angioina,” in *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 3 (Naples, 1969), 684–685; Giovanni Vitolo and Rosalba di Meglio, *Napoli angioino-aragonese. Confraternite ospedali dinamiche politico-sociali* (Salerno, 2003), 64–67.

<sup>3</sup> Some examples are the Costanzo (from Pozzuoli, settled in the *seggio* of Portanova) and the Pappacoda (from Ischia, settled in the *seggio* of Porto): see Giuliana Vitale, *Élite burocratica e famiglia. Dinamiche nobiliari e processi di costruzione statale nella Napoli angioino-aragonese* (Naples, 2003), 149, 247–251.

cash.<sup>4</sup> As Michelangelo Schipa has written, “this new quarter beyond the city walls, between the *rua catalana* and the loggia of the Genoese, full of factories, warehouses, offices, workshops, full of movement and noise, was a spring of new wealth and represented a new world alongside the old indigenous population.”<sup>5</sup>

In the early decades of Angevin rule this immigration provoked hostility from the native citizenry. The reason the royal document of 1272 cited above mentioned foreign merchants and courtiers in the capital was because a number of murders had occurred “on account of” them.<sup>6</sup> Antagonism was yet worse in 1284. Since the rebellion of Sicily two years earlier, the Angevins had been at war with the island’s new Aragonese masters, and their ability to reclaim the island remained far from assured. When Prince Charles of Anjou (the future Charles II) was captured in a sea battle off the Naples coast in 1284, it must have seemed to some that Angevin dominion on the mainland was also on the verge of collapse, and the Neapolitan populace, taking advantage of this moment, lashed out against French settlers in the capital, murdering them and sacking and setting fire to their houses.<sup>7</sup>

Naples’ patricians seem to have taken a more sanguine view. During the uprising of 1284 they remained loyal to the Angevins, from whom they could hope to (and did) receive considerable advantages. They benefited as well from the growing population of foreign merchants, to whom they rented the shops and warehouses in the port area that many elite local families owned.<sup>8</sup> But the transformed and still uncertain social landscape provoked anxiety among them too, resulting, as we shall see in the next section, in an effort to close ranks against both foreign and indigenous rivals. It is doubtless this contemporary anxiety that explains the *Cronaca di Partenope*’s repeated lament about foreign immigration and the resultant “contamination” of Neapolitan blood. In the *Cronaca*, the trauma is transposed to the distant past, specifically to two early-medieval battles in which the local population was allegedly decimated

---

<sup>4</sup> This story is Day 2, story 5: see the translation of Mark Musa and Peter Bondanella (London and New York, 1982).

<sup>5</sup> Michelangelo Schipa, “Nobili e popolani in Napoli nel medioevo in rapporto all’amministrazione municipale,” *Archivio storico italiano* ser. 7, 3 (1925), 31.

<sup>6</sup> See above at n. 1.

<sup>7</sup> So narrated Saba Malaspina in his *Istoria delle cose di Sicilia 1250–1285*, edited in G. del Re, *Cronisti e scrittori sincroni napoletani*, vol. 2 (Naples, 1868), 395; cited in Giovanni Vitolo, “Il regno angioino,” in *Storia del Mezzogiorno*, vol. 4 (Rome, 1986), 42.

<sup>8</sup> Vitale, *Élite burocratica*, 41–43.



and reconstituted only by immigration. Bartolomeo's insistence on this theme, however, suggests that it hit close to home. Significantly, the "foreigners" named as repopulating Naples came from places as nearby as Capua, Sorrento, and Amalfi, as well as from Calabria, France, and further afield. To Neapolitan patricians like Bartolomeo, the influx of Campanian neighbors was evidently as troubling as that of men from distant lands.

There are some clues, however, that Bartolomeo excluded the high nobility from this censure. Toward the end of the *Cronaca* Bartolomeo lists the counts ennobled by the first three Angevin kings. None of these men were Neapolitans. Instead, like the "contaminating" foreigners named in earlier chapters, they were transalpine natives or men from other towns and regions of southern Italy. Yet the narrative context in which these lists appear suggests that Bartolomeo viewed such ennoblements with approbation: he included them among the good deeds accomplished by each of the first three Angevin kings. Doubtless Bartolomeo exempted them from criticism because they represented the class to which civic patricians aspired. By praising such royal appointments, Bartolomeo implicitly encouraged their continuance, through which patricians themselves could hope for similar elevation.<sup>9</sup>

Famous scholars and artists seem to represent a second group whose immigration to Naples escaped condemnation. The *Cronaca* mentions only one explicitly: Niccolò da Reggio, a Calabrian who spent fifteen years in Naples translating Greek medical works for King Robert. Bartolomeo credits to him the translation of a Greek temple inscription offered in chapter 7, and though the deficiency of this translation makes it very unlikely Niccolò was involved, the invocation of his name was clearly meant to authenticate it, suggesting Niccolò's high reputation in the eyes of Bartolomeo and his contemporaries.<sup>10</sup> The great Tuscan artist Giotto also makes an indirect appearance in the *Cronaca*: without naming him explicitly, Bartolomeo praises the chapel he frescoed for King Robert as "excellently painted," in one of the *Cronaca*'s few references to

---

<sup>9</sup> The same social aspirations lay behind southern Italians' occasional patronage of translations of literary works not into Neapolitan but into French, the idiom of the new social elite that they wished to join: see Francesco Sabatini, *Napoli angioina, Cultura e società* (Naples, 1975), 84.

<sup>10</sup> On Niccolò's career in Naples, see Francesco Lo Parco, *Niccolò da Reggio grecista italiota del secolo XIV* (Naples, 1909), 5–17. Lo Parco's belief that Niccolò was responsible for the *Cronaca*'s Latin translation of the temple inscription is contradicted by the evidence of the *Cronaca* itself: see Appendix I below at notes to chapter 7.

an Angevin architectural project.<sup>11</sup> Bartolomeo's pride in the excellence of Naples' university might also be considered an implicit recognition of foreigners' cultural contribution to the city, if we consider that in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century most of its distinguished professors were Frenchmen, northern Italians, or men from other regions of southern Italy.<sup>12</sup> Where Bartolomeo's approbation of foreign counts seems to reflect a more narrowly patrician viewpoint, these comments suggest a broader Neapolitan pride in the heightened cultural prestige brought to the city by foreign men.

All told, the *Cronaca* expresses the complexity of patrician response to Naples' social transformation. While hostile to non-Neapolitans generally as "contaminating" foreigners, it also approves of the creation of new feudal nobles, despite their foreign extraction, presumably because of the possibilities this avenue represented for patricians themselves, and takes pride in the heightened cultural status of the city accomplished by foreign scholars' and artists' activity there.

### *The Political Landscape*

The establishment of the royal administration in Naples also transformed the political landscape of Naples. The municipal government, known as the Curia di San Paolo because it met near the church of San Paolo on the ancient forum, had been dominated for centuries, with a few interruptions, by the local landowning elites. It comprised a varying number of magistrates (called consuls or, later, *eletti*), judges, tax assessors, and other officers under the direction a crown appointee.<sup>13</sup> Among its traditional

---

<sup>11</sup> Giotto resided in Naples from 1328 to 1334, when he frescoed Castel Nuovo's throne hall and palatine chapel and began work on the chapel of San Martino, finished after his departure by Tino da Camaino. See Ferdinando Bologna, *I pittori alla corte angioina di Napoli, 1266-1414* (Rome, 1969), 183-187. The *Cronaca* mentions this chapel in chapter 75A/94B.

<sup>12</sup> G.M. Monti observes that the professors of Naples' university were generally non-*regnicoli* for the first four decades of Angevin rule, who were later outnumbered by southern Italians from beyond Campania. See "L'età angioina," in *Storia della università di Napoli* (Naples, 1924; repr. 1993), 100, with lists of professors of various disciplines on 79-87.

<sup>13</sup> Vitolo, "Il regno angioino," 39, notes the continuity of the dominant class of "possessori dei beni fondiari" in the municipal government from the early Middle Ages forward. The appointed head of the local administration was called at various times a *compalazzo*, *baiulo*, or captain of the city; on him and the principal officers of the municipal government, see Michelangelo Schipa, "Nobili e popolani," 12-35.

duties were civic maintenance and defense, the judgment of homicides and other crimes, and the apportionment among the citizens of the tax that Naples owed to the royal government. The greatly increased size and importance of Naples as the realm's capital doubtless expanded the areas traditionally managed by the municipal government, such as building projects and port activity.<sup>14</sup> At the same time, the municipal government's control over such affairs was diminished: the presence of a higher, royal authority in the same locality, and that authority's intense interest in civic affairs, resulted in overlapping spheres of competence in which the royal government inevitably prevailed. With the royal courts of the Grand Justiciar and the Vicarial Tribunal now established in Naples, the municipal government lost its jurisdiction over criminal cases and in general "declined in authority and importance;" the constable, once in charge of military operations for the city, was reduced to the role of guarding the port area at night.<sup>15</sup> Building projects certainly increased in number and importance under the Angevins and were often funded out of city coffers, but it was generally the crown that initiated such projects and that appointed the personnel in charge. The crown also undertook public works meant to raise the city to an appropriately royal level: paving the city's streets and the roads leading to it, draining swamps on its outskirts, repairing its aqueducts and wells.<sup>16</sup> It even passed edicts on mundane matters of municipal conduct and public order.<sup>17</sup> Such edicts were not unwelcome royal intrusions on local custom. On the contrary, several originated with citizen complaints. They signal the alacrity with which

---

<sup>14</sup> Guido d'Agostino, "Napoli capitale (1266–1860)," in *Storia del Mezzogiorno*, vol. 5 (Rome, 1986), 31; Vitolo, "Il regno angioino," 43.

<sup>15</sup> Schipa, "Nobili e popolani," 33–35.

<sup>16</sup> To cite a few examples: work on the Formello aqueduct was begun in 1271; Charles II ordered the paving of the road from Naples to Posillipo in 1290 and the paving of and widening of streets within the city "ad tollenda sordes et espurcitas," as well as the draining of swamps; in 1322 the royal government decreed that the three major thoroughfares of Naples be paved with stones from an old Roman road, that the waters around Forcella be canalized, and that wells be cleaned. Vitale, *Élite burocratica*, 48; Giuseppe de Blasiis, "Napoli nella prima metà del secolo XIV," *ASPN n.s.* 1 (1915), 255n and 256.

<sup>17</sup> Matteo Camera, *Annali delle due Sicilie*, 2 vols. (Naples, 1860), vol. 2, 285–286, on a prohibition against throwing dirty water into the street; Domenico Ambrasi, "La vita religiosa," in *Storia di Napoli* vol. 3 (Naples, 1969), 454, on the prohibition of business on holy days; Romualdo Trifone, *La legislazione angioina* (Naples, 1921), 251–255, on an edict of 1332 prohibiting "lascivious and insolent young men" from seducing and running off with young girls (*lascivi et insolentes iuvenes ... de parentum domibus clandestine rapiunt*).

Neapolitans turned to the royal government for regulation of civic affairs and defense of their own particular interests.<sup>18</sup> Just as clearly, however, they illustrated that the royal and not the civic government was now the final arbiter of local affairs.

Nor did the Angevin kings refrain from intervening in the composition of the civic government itself. The number of civic magistrates, which varied under previous dynasties, was set at six, and scattered lists suggest they were to be divided between patricians and *popolani*.<sup>19</sup> Complaints of the abuses of civic tax collectors, traditionally drawn from the civic elite, led King Charles II to insist in 1294 that these six assessors represent Naples' three classes, *migliori*, *mediani*, and *minori*. He reversed this blow to patrician hegemony as soon as 1301, decreeing instead that only the richest Neapolitans serve in this office.<sup>20</sup> But his successor Robert continued the campaign of equitable reform, ordering in 1314 that representation among the city's judges be divided between the noble and popular *seggi*.<sup>21</sup> The crown's appropriation of traditionally civic duties, its intervention in civic administration, and its very presence as a superior authority with realm-wide reach clearly established it as the new magnetic center for all Neapolitans seeking redress, opportunity, and access to power.

The patriciate, if its hegemony in the city were to persist, would have to accommodate to this reality, and accommodate it did. One strategy was to enter the ranks of the royal government. Patrician Neapolitan families

---

<sup>18</sup> As Ambrasi noted (see previous note), the edict prohibiting business on holidays was published in 1330, but merchants had complained of this practice by competitors as early as 1323. The seduction of young girls seems to have been a strategy to compel the girls' marriage to the offender, whence it was opposed by patrician families seeking to maintain control over marital strategies: Vitale, *Élite burocratica*, 100.

<sup>19</sup> D'Agostino dates the creation of the six *eletti* to 1306 ("Napoli capitale," 31), Vitolo more generally to the early fourteenth century ("Il regno angioino," 44). In 1296, they included three patricians and three *popolani*; again in 1327, they were three patricians (including two Caracciolo), a judge of unspecified status, and two *popolani*. See Carlo Borelli, *Repertorium universale familiarum et terrarum existentium in registris realis* (unpublished manuscript, 1706), 56, and Sigismundo Sicola, *Primus elechus nonnullarum illustrium familiarum ... ex regali archivio Magne Regie Curie* (unpublished manuscript, 1686), 642, 992.

<sup>20</sup> "... *de melioribus, ditioribus, et sufficientioribus hominibus civitatis*": cited in Schipa, "Nobili e popolani," 36.

<sup>21</sup> The decree of 1314 led four of the city's popular *seggi* to fight over whose turn it was to elect the two judges reserved to them: *ibid.*, 33–35. Another reform of 1330 sought to guarantee the expertise of these judges, "qui sint ... viri licterati, iurisperiti, vel per quotidianam usum peritiam comprobati": Camera, *Annali*, vol. 2, 126–127.

appear to have been quite scarce in the Staufen administrative apparatus, but sought and obtained such positions under the Angevins with great regularity.<sup>22</sup> Though in rare cases a Neapolitan patrician might enter the highest ranks of the royal government, as did Bartolomeo Brancaccio in becoming vice-chancellor of the realm before his death in 1341, the vast majority of patricians served in what might be called the influential middle ranks: as provincial justiciars, military captains, and fiscal officers, or as minor officials of the royal household.<sup>23</sup> These were promising avenues of advancement for a patriciate whose feudal properties were still “truly modest” at the start of the Angevin age, consisting largely of plots along Naples’ shore (an area long considered part of the royal demesne) or fractions of port dues.<sup>24</sup> Service as military captains made them indispensable to the state in an era characterized, here as throughout Europe, by the decline of feudal service. The provincial justiciarate, for its part, offered Neapolitan families the opportunity to gain a foothold in the realm’s provinces, where they could set about making alliances and acquiring lands.

Precisely because of their advantages, however, such posts were eagerly sought by other groups—knightly families from France or Provence, and ambitious native families of the kingdom’s various provinces—who were thus rivals of the capital’s patriciate in the quest for political and social advancement. Up to the 1340s, indeed, these rivals seem to have had greater success.<sup>25</sup> To my knowledge, only one Neapolitan succeeded in translating royal service into a comital title before the reign of Joanna I: Bartolomeo Siginulfo, grand admiral and grand chamberlain of the realm, who was invested with the counties of Caserta and Telesse in the

---

<sup>22</sup> For a general comparison see Vitolo, “Il regno angioino,” 40–42.

<sup>23</sup> For representative careers within the Brancaccio, Loffredo, and Vulcano families, all members of the highest urban patriciate, see Vitale, *Élite burocratica*, 210–219, 221–225. On Bartolomeo Brancaccio, see Ambrasi, “La vita religiosa,” 526, and G.M. Monti, “L’età angioina,” 98.

<sup>24</sup> Vitale, *Élite burocratica*, 33–40.

<sup>25</sup> The Pipino of Barletta were enfeoffed with several counties in the early fourteenth century; the Burson, natives of northern France, rose through the same ranks of justiciar and military captain to become counts of Satriano in 1335; the exemplary administrative service of Bartolomeo da Capua (a Campanian, but not a Neapolitan) led to his son’s elevation as count of Altavilla by 1337. See Sylvie Pollastri, “Les Bursons d’Anjou, barons de Nocera puis comtes de Satriano (1268–1400),” in *La noblesse dans les territoires angevins à la fin du moyen âge*, ed. N. Coulet and J.-M. Matz (Rome, 2000), 89–114, esp. 95–101 and accompanying chart. All these ennoblements were recorded in the *Cronaca* at chapter 75A/94B.

first decade of the fourteenth century. This “impressive concentration of offices, powers, and possessions” doubtless contributed to his swift downfall, however: in 1310 he was accused of treason and escaped death only by fleeing to Aragonese Sicily.<sup>26</sup> Bartolomeo Siginulfo’s career demonstrates how tenuous the urban patriciate’s foothold in the feudal nobility still was in these decades, and helps to explain the social anxiety and social aspirations felt by others of his social group.<sup>27</sup>

Patricians also maintained the time-honored practice of placing members in the local ecclesiastical hierarchy, which can be considered a part of their “political” strategy. The Caracciolo and other prominent Neapolitan families regularly placed relatives among the cathedral clergy and related cardinal deaconries of the city.<sup>28</sup> Patrician women, meanwhile, reflected their families’ status through membership in noble nunneries: Santa Patrizia doubtless owes its prominent place in the *Cronaca* to its status as a patrician institution.<sup>29</sup> Yet the proximity of the crown altered the composition of the local clergy and the social logic of ecclesiastical careers as much as secular ones. On the one hand, royal patronage could now effect faster advancement through Church ranks, as it did for two of Bartolomeo’s clan, Francesco and Landulfo Caracciolo.<sup>30</sup> On the

---

<sup>26</sup> The quotation and a summary of Bartolomeo’s career are in Vitale, *Élite burocratica*, 240–245.

<sup>27</sup> Though absent from the original, “A” version of the *Cronaca*, Bartolomeo and his brother were remembered in the redacted, “B” version at chapter 93B as “noble and powerful knights” and “citizens of Naples” whom King Charles II “magnified” with the offices of grand chamberlain and grand admiral (Bartolomeo took on both roles after his brother the admiral’s death in 1306).

<sup>28</sup> The Caracciolo boasted the cathedral subdeacons Jacopo in 1326, Pietro in 1335, Bartolomeo (our author’s son and the future archbishop of Bari) in 1345, and Marcello in 1360; cardinal deacons were Pietro (1301), Marino (1323, also vicar general of archbishop Hubert d’Ormont), Tirello (1349), and Niccolò (1354). Brancaccio clerics included a cardinal deacon, a cathedral subdeacon, and a *primicerius* between 1329 and 1340. See the lists compiled by Pasquale Santamaria, *Historia collegii Patrum Canoniarum metropolitanae ecclesiae Neapolitanae* (Naples, 1900), where these names appear on 396–399, 418, and 499–521.

<sup>29</sup> Annamaria Facchiano, *Monasteri femminili e nobiltà a Napoli tra medioevo ed età moderna. Il necrologio di S. Patrizia (secc. XII–XVI)* (Altavilla Silentina, 1992), 13, 49, and *passim* on its noble character. The first abbess whose surname is recorded was a Caracciolo (Agnese), in 1173.

<sup>30</sup> Francesco Caracciolo’s theological studies at Paris received financial support at the crown’s request in the first decade of the fourteenth century; in 1309 he became chancellor of the Parisian *studium*. See P. Glorieux, “Caracciolo, Francesco,” in *DBI*, vol. 19 (Rome, 1976), 356–358. When the Franciscan friar Landulfo Caracciolo became bishop of Castellamare di Stabia in 1327, King Robert asked the pope to supplement Landulfo’s income, leading to Landulfo’s transfer to the richer archbishopric of Amalfi in

other hand, royal patronage of ecclesiastics just as often went to non-Neapolitans, creating the conditions for a rivalry similar to that seen in the pursuit of administrative posts.<sup>31</sup>

Perhaps most conspicuous to the local citizenry was the series of foreign archbishops who headed the cathedral in the early Angevin age. They included Ayglerius, from a noble Provençal family (1270–1281/2), who along with his brother Bernardo, the equally powerful abbot of Montecassino, enjoyed very close relations with the crown; Jacopo da Viterbo (1302–1308), from central Italy, and Hubert d’Ormont (1308–1320), another Provençal who had come south in the train of Charles I; and three men from important comital families of the Roman campagna, Bertaldo Orsini (1324–1325), Annibale Caetani di Ceccano (1326–1327), and Giovanni Caetani Orsini (1327–1357). Some of these men, like Bertaldo and Annibale, were essentially absentee archbishops for whom Naples was a brief stop on the way to higher posts. Others, like Hubert d’Ormont, had spent much of their careers in the city: he had been a cardinal deacon and abbot of S. Giorgio Maggiore, and gained the archbishopric by the election of its canons, not royal or papal appointment. But the string of foreign men at the head of a central symbol of Neapolitan civic identity—only one native son, Filippo Minutolo (1288–1301), interrupts their succession—spoke eloquently of the impact of the crown’s presence in the city.<sup>32</sup>

While utilizing royal service and crown patronage as new avenues to secular and ecclesiastical advancement, patricians’ other principal strategy was to maintain their hold over the municipal government. Despite its diminished authority—which patricians circumvented by obtaining

---

1331. Thereafter Landulfo worked closely with the crown, and was rewarded by Robert’s successor Joanna I with the highest administrative position in the kingdom, that of protonotary, in 1349. He died in 1351. See M. Palma, “Caracciolo, Landulfo,” in *DBI*, vol. 19, 406–410.

<sup>31</sup> The royal chapel, for instance, became a springboard to higher ecclesiastical positions (under Robert, seven chaplains became bishops or archbishops in the realm), but its markedly international character left little room for native Neapolitans. See the chapel careers discussed in Anna Maria Voci, “La cappella di corte dei primi sovrani angioini di Napoli,” *ASPN* 133 (1995), 100–124. Similarly, royal influence advanced the careers of foreign as well as Neapolitan clerics: see the brief summary of Paolino da Venezia’s career in S. Kelly, *The New Solomon*, 49, 60, and notes.

<sup>32</sup> Ambrasi, “La vita religiosa,” 440–458, and on Jacopo da Viterbo, D. Anderson, “‘Dominus Ludovicus’ in the sermons of Jacobus of Viterbo (Arch. S. Pietro D. 213),” in *Literature and Religion in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. R. Newhauser and J. Alford (Binghamton, NY, 1995), 275–295.

crown appointments to oversee certain civic matters, resulting in the same control over public monies, and the same opportunity to line their own pockets—the Curia di San Paolo maintained some legal authority, as well as the duty to apportion and collect taxes.<sup>33</sup> Influence over it clearly remained significant, and in the highly fluid environment of the early Angevin age led to considerable strife between and among patricians and *popolani*. The structure that gave form to these struggles was that of the *seggi*, and their nature and evolution, murky though they remain, require some explanation.

The *seggi* (also called *tocchi*, *piazze*, *platee*, or *sedili*) were neighborhood associations that took on a more formal role as political and fiscal units over the course of the later Middle Ages.<sup>34</sup> If that definition is vague, so was the *seggi*'s status in the decades around 1300, when they were at once geographical, political, and social organisms. The *platea Capuana*, for instance, could simultaneously denote a geographical area and a partially distinct administrative unit, as it did in the Angevin document of 1298 that spoke of the forty-seven households of the “*platea Capuana* and of the other *platee* of this *platea Capuana*.”<sup>35</sup> Complicating matters further, a given geographical unit (for instance, Forcella) could encompass two juridical-fiscal units, one “noble” the other “popular,” who were taxed differently and had different rights of representation in the municipal government. In such a situation it is clearly difficult to know what meaning to attach to the lists of *seggi* in official documents, and scholarly attempts to pin down their names and numbers, which vary from one study to the next, necessarily involve a considerable degree of guesswork.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Examples include Ligorio Minutolo, appointed to oversee urban improvements in 1290 and 1294, and Giovanni Signulfo, overseer of repair on an aqueduct in 1271 but investigated for graft (having spent only 16 of the 100 ounces assigned to the project) in 1278. See Vitale, *Élite burocratica*, 48. Given the crown's assumption of criminal jurisdiction, Naples' civic judges probably adjudicated only civil disputes.

<sup>34</sup> I use the modern term *seggio* for clarity; *platea* was the more common term in the Angevin era, and could denote a street, neighborhood, or administrative unit. Much ink has been spilled on their origins and evolution in the Middle Ages, a succinct summary of which can be found in Vitolo, “Il regno angioino,” 42–43.

<sup>35</sup> Cited in Schipa, “Nobili e popolani,” 40.

<sup>36</sup> Arnaldo Venditti, for instance, identifies six “major” and 23 “minor” *seggi* at the start of Angevin dominion, reduced to sixteen under Charles II, to ten in 1332, and to five in 1338: “Urbanistica,” 685. Carlo de Frede, like most scholars, speaks instead of “noble” and “popular” *seggi*, of which he counts 18 of the former “from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries” (but only five in 1301), 25 of the latter under Frederick II (whose numbers increased in later decades), and ten or eleven with a mixed population of



This much, however, seems clear. Both before and during the Angevin era the tax owed by the city to the royal government was apportioned by *seggi*, and within the *seggi* by social class (noble or popular), such that nobles paid far less than *popolani*.<sup>37</sup> Municipal officers were also elected by and intended to represent the different *seggi*.<sup>38</sup> But families' assignment to a particular *seggio*, and to a status within that *seggio*, were easily circumvented in the early Angevin era. *Seggi* of the city center, for instance, were losing families to the new neighborhoods in the "lower city" (near the port) or outside the walls.<sup>39</sup> Some families identified as popular petitioned to be taxed as nobles, and were resisted by other *popolani* whose share of the tax burden would thereby increase.<sup>40</sup> Meanwhile, the total number of *seggi* was steadily decreasing as more dominant ones absorbed their smaller or weaker neighbors.<sup>41</sup> This was

---

nobles and *popolani* ("Da Carlo I," 52–53). Lists of *seggi* whose representatives witnessed royal documents are of little help, since we cannot know if they were comprehensive. The ten *seggi* Venditti identifies in 1332, for instance, probably derive from a civic edict (against the rapine of young girls) of that year that representatives of some *seggi* witnessed, but Guiliana Vitale gives the number of *seggi* represented in that edict as seven (*Élite burocratica*, 100).

<sup>37</sup> A reliable witness to this is a royal document of 1301, which is likely to be comprehensive in its list of *seggi* because its purpose was the collection of taxes from the city as a whole. Of the 692 ounces, 8 tari, and 4 grains owed annually by the city, five *seggi* designated as noble paid a total of 72 ounces, ten or eleven *seggi* that included both noble and popular elements paid a total of 170 ounces, and the remaining popular *seggi*, whose number is not given, paid a total of 450 ounces. Even within *seggi* containing both noble and popular communities, the tax burden was uneven: in the *seggio* of Forcella the nobles paid two ounces, the *popolani* slightly less than twenty. See Schipa, "Nobili e popolani," 37–38. Guido d'Agostino has claimed that this unequal tax distribution was corrected in a reform of 1306 that changed the mode of taxation from a direct tax to an indirect tax on goods. Yet Schipa cites a document of 1418 in which the tax due from the city was still 692 ounces, 8 tari, 4 grains: see his "Contese sociali a Napoli nel medio evo," *ASPN* 31 (1906), 615n.

<sup>38</sup> See nn. 19–21 above.

<sup>39</sup> The nobles of Forcella complained that the quota of 12 ounces, 12 tari, fixed under Frederick II when they comprised nine houses, had now (under Charles I) to be paid by only three. On this and the general demographic movement south and west, see Schipa, "Nobilie popolani," 36.

<sup>40</sup> One Ligorio Crescenzo, for example, complained to Charles I that though he had always contributed with the nobles of the region of Forcella, the *popolani* wanted to constrain him to contribute with them. The Maiorani brothers of Portanova, apparently another *seggio* including both noble and popular communities, obtained from Charles I the right to be taxed with the nobles, but after a complaint lodged by their fellows were reduced by Charles II to their earlier, *popolano* status. *Ibid.*, 37.

<sup>41</sup> Despite their different figures, the scholars cited in n. 36 above all agree on the general pattern of diminishing numbers of distinct *seggi*. Schipa ("Nobili e popolani, 41) notes that Nido absorbed the *seggi* of San Gennaro a Diaconia and Casanova, while Capuana absorbed the *seggio* of the Melaci and that of Santo Stefano.

probably a response to as well as an added factor in the fluid status and definition of the *seggi*, as some groups sought to defend their status and rights (and decrease their tax burden) through larger numbers.

The result was tensions at all social levels. *Popolani* fought among themselves, over the efforts of some to escape popular status and in their competition for the limited government representation they enjoyed; patricians and *popolani* fought each other, both legally (for instance, in popular complaints about elite tax collectors) and physically.<sup>42</sup> In 1334 or 1335, two members of the noble *seggio* of Capuana wounded one *Masenus Cicalensis* (presumably not noble) from the new, extra-urban neighborhood around the Castel Nuovo, with the help of some equally patrician associates in crime, including several Caracciolo.<sup>43</sup> The late-fourteenth-century *Cronicon Siculum* mentions another encounter, this time in 1344: “on the fifteenth of August, nobles of the *seggi* of Capuana and Nido, in discord with men of middling status and rich merchants, rode on horseback to the forum of Naples in order to fight with them; they [the *mediani* and *popolo grasso*] did not dare to come to that square, but rather fled from it.”<sup>44</sup>

This chronicle’s identification of Capuana and Nido as the “noble” antagonists is significant, for it was in fact these two *seggi* that had recently succeeded in establishing themselves as superior to all others. By absorbing nearby associations, increasing their numbers, and apparently terrorizing members of other *seggi*, they had created such animosity that in 1338 King Robert was constrained to intervene. “At the instigation of the Enemy of Man, cause for grave dissension and scandal has erupted between the men of Capuana and Nido, on the one hand, and those of the other *seggi* of our city of Naples on the other, regarding the governance of the city and other matters,” resulting in “many instances of persecution, wounding, murder, injury, and other offenses.”<sup>45</sup> The king’s

<sup>42</sup> See the examples in nn. 20–21 and 40 above.

<sup>43</sup> Borelli, *Repertorium*, 154. The protagonists were Andrea and Riccardo Vulcano; their *socii criminis* were Francesco Caracciolo, son of Giovanni Caracciolo *detto* Pullistro, Niccolo Caracciolo *detto* Viola, a Filomarino, a Piscitello, and a Marogano.

<sup>44</sup> Eodem anno [1344] die XV augusti, nobiles Neapolitani platearum Capuane et Nidi, habentes discordiam cum reliquis hominibus medianis et populo grasso, equitaverunt ad forum civitatis Neapolis causa preliandi cum eis, qui ad predictum campum ausi venire non fuerunt, set a predicto ca[m]pu aufugerunt.” Giuseppe de Blasiis, ed., *Cronicon Siculum* (Naples, 1887), 9.

<sup>45</sup> “Dum ab olim instigante humani generis Inimico, inter homines Capuane et Nidi ex una parte et alios de plateis aliis civitatis nostre Neap. gravis dissensionis et scandali esset suscitata materia super disponendis, ordinandis, tractandis et gubernandis negotiis

solution, published in July 1339, was to reserve for Capuana and Nido alone one third of all civic duties and honors, while “the remaining men of the other *seggi* and the *popolani* of those *seggi* shall have two-thirds.”<sup>46</sup> Previously, all noble *seggi* had elected three of six magistrates and three of five judges; now Capuana-Nido alone would elect two of six magistrates and presumably two of five judges. This not only left a single magistrate and judge for all other noble *seggi*, but classed the latter indiscriminately with the *popolo*.

It may be that this Edict of Peace, as it is sometimes called, essentially confirmed an existing status quo, but in formalizing Capuana-Nido’s special status it cemented their hegemony over other civic groups. Capuana and Nido took a further step to guarantee their position by forming a marriage pact between them that would effectively close their ranks to lesser men. As G.M. Monti has observed, this agreement, established in the early 1350s, signalled the “aggregation and *serrata* of the knights in the *seggi* of Capuana and Nido ... a necessary movement to defend themselves from clashes with inferior classes, with foreigners, and even with the royal power.”<sup>47</sup> The chagrin felt by those nobles left out of Capuana and Nido can be imagined. And indeed, hostility between Capuana-Nido and other noble *seggi* persisted. Less than ten days after the street fight between Capuana-Nido and the *popolo grasso* mentioned above, “the nobles of the *seggio* of Nido fought with those of Portanova and Porto, and bested them at the wall of San Giovanni Maggiore; in the fighting, Giovanni [Brancaccio] Zoso was killed.”<sup>48</sup>

---

civitatibus eiusdem et causis aliis .... Hinc inde diversae persecutiones, vulnera, homicidia, iniuria et offensiones alie ....” The edict is published in Giovanni Antonio Summonte, *Historia della città e regno di Napoli* (Naples, 1675; first published 1601), Book III, chapter 3, pp. 401–405, here 401.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid, 404. Shortly afterward Robert clarified that in speaking of the “distribution of a third of duties and honors among those of Capuana and Nido, and two thirds among those of the remaining *seggi* together with the popular [*seggi*], we intended and intend by ‘popolo’ those who are commonly called ‘grasso,’ and not the *popolo minuto* and artisans, who are not usually implicated, nor should they be implicated, in such duties and honors.”

<sup>47</sup> G.M. Monti, “Il Patto dotale napoletano di Capuana e Nido,” in *Dal Duecento al Settecento. Studi storico-giuridici* (Naples, 1925), 1–39, at 29, cited in Vitale, *Élite burocratica*, 96n. The *seggi* of Capuana and Nido also obtained recognition of their own customs or “consuetudini” regarding the transmission of property no later than 1351, when they were included in Sebastiano Napolitano’s authoritative edition of the Consuetudine of the city of Naples: see Carla Vetere, *Le Consuetudini di Napoli. Il testo e la tradizione* (Naples, 1999), 30–33, with edition at 109–114.

<sup>48</sup> “Eodem anno die XXIII augusti in vigilia sancti Bartholomei de nocte nobiles

It will be remembered that Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa was not only a member of Nido, but one of its representatives in municipal government. He must have been closely involved in its efforts to solidify social and political dominance over other *seggi*, which were still underway when he wrote in the late 1340s. This context explains his emphasis on Nido as one of Naples' "original" and most ancient *seggi*, and his denigration of Porto and Portanova as inferior parvenus. As he observed in chapter 13, the original Greek city comprised three "piazze"—a term used here to refer to its major thoroughfares, but that was also a synonym for *seggi*. "The rest of the city," he continues, "stood in swamps outside the walls, especially near the *piazza* now called Porto." Chapter 14 elaborates on this implicit hierarchy. After ancient Naples had withstood attack from several enemy powers, three Palaepolitans petitioned to join it, and were permitted to build fortresses at its edges to improve its defense. Partway through his identification of the fortresses' location, Bartolomeo interrupts himself to list the six "original" *seggi* of Naples, all located along its major thoroughfares and including, of course, Capuana and his own Nido. Returning, in chapter 16, to the three later settlers, he writes that "in the addition made to the city by these gentlemen ... and their followers, the *seggio* of Portanova was later created," populated by these settlers and their followers "who became new neighbors and citizens. And afterward was created the *seggio* or *piazza* of Porto ... which was unsafe due to the wind," i.e. presumably because it lay in an open area by the coast.

In this way Bartolomeo intimated that Porto and Portanova—two *seggi* with which his own had recently fought—were not intrinsic to the ancient city but "additions," located in swampy or unsafe areas and inhabited by men who were, ambiguously, both "citizens" and merely "neighbors." By the fifteenth century, when Portanova and Porto were numbered among the city's five noble *seggi*, such comments would have had little meaning. But in the years around 1350 they had a precise valence, as expressions of the social superiority of Nido and Capuana, only recently achieved, over rival *seggi* whose juridical status or wealth and power were actually quite similar and therefore all the more threatening.

---

platee Nidi preliaverunt cum illis de Portanova et Porto, et eos vincerunt in curti Iohannis maioris; prelio mortuus fuit Iohannes Zozus." 'Zozus' was a cognomen of the Brancaccio family. See Giuseppe de Blasiis, ed., *Cronicon Siculum*, 9, and n. 7.

*The Physical Landscape*

The background to these social and political changes was the physical transformation of Naples, whose extent and importance has long been recognized. Speaking very generally, the physical transformation wrought by the Angevins may be said to have two aspects. The first was the irreversible shift of Naples' center of gravity away from its three ancient thoroughfares—home to the municipal government, the traditional market, and many patrician families—toward the new royal and commercial neighborhoods established to the south and west. The second was the interventions of the crown and its non-Neapolitan officers in the “patrician” center city itself.

The first Angevin structure in Naples was the Castel Nuovo, built at the command of Charles I from 1279 to 1283 and enlarged through the 1330s.<sup>49</sup> Located outside the city walls to the southwest, it became the epicenter of a new royal quarter. The open space on its landward side, known as the piazza delle Correggie, gave its name to the whole area, which soon housed a number of other royal buildings: palaces for Angevin princes, a new judicial headquarters, and various structures used to house the royal archive, scriptorium, and stables.<sup>50</sup> At least some royal officials also settled in this area, doubtless for proximity to the court and administration: Niccolò d'Alife, royal secretary, complained in the late 1330s of “*mulieres inhonestae*” near his house on the via delle Correggie, and Pedro de Cadenuto, regent of the Vicarial Tribunal, owned several houses near the Castel Nuovo and may have lived in one of them.<sup>51</sup>

Located along the shore, the city's new royal quarter shaded into the port area to its east, where the Angevins undertook a series of improvements and religious foundations. The tiny ducal-era “Arcina” port was enlarged and given a wharf, the “Molo angioino,” between 1301

---

<sup>49</sup> Venditti, “Urbanistica,” 676.

<sup>50</sup> Giuseppe de Blasiis, “Le case dei principi angioini nella piazza di Castelnuovo,” *ASPN* 11 (1886), 470–477 and *ASPN* 12 (1887), 302; N. Barone, *La ‘Ratio Thesauriorum’ della cancelleria angioina* (Naples, 1885), 88, on the rental of a house for royal scribes.

<sup>51</sup> On Niccolò's complaint, see Camera, *Annali*, vol. 2, 229. De Blasiis notes Pedro's possession of several houses “in pendino Castri Novi,” that the crown bought for royal use, and surmises that “people connected to the court began to live in the environs” of the castle once the royal family was settled there: art. cit. (see previous note), vol. 11, 471, and vol. 12, 302.

and 1306. This was one of the few Angevin civic improvements that merited mention in the *Cronaca di Partenope*. The larger port, known since the twelfth century as the “Port of the Pisans,” gained a new arsenal between 1305 and 1308, while yet a third was built at the eastern end of the shore in the 1330s.<sup>52</sup> This eastern coastal area was itself built up by the crown. Dotted with new royal religious foundations, its centerpiece was the *mercato nuovo*, established by Charles I to replace the *mercato vecchio* located in the heart of the old city.<sup>53</sup> The Angevins’ great coastal projects, from the royal quarter on the west to the mercantile and port area stretching eastward, constituted a major shift in Naples’ urban fabric and life. As Caroline Bruzelius has observed, “this expansion was forever to change the configuration of Naples, for two vital activities, the market and the court, now took place outside the ancient city.”<sup>54</sup>

While the Angevins focused their urbanistic transformations on the piazza delle Correggie and the port area, they made their mark as well in the old center city, home to Naples’ most elite families and to its ancient institutions. Starting in 1284 and continuing to 1325, the Dominican monastery of San Domenico, located near the middle of the lower decumanus, was greatly enlarged and rededicated to Charles II’s preferred saint, Mary Magdalen, whose remains Charles had “discovered” in Provence.<sup>55</sup> An even bolder and more ambitious project began in 1294: namely, the complete rebuilding of Naples’ cathedral, located at the eastern end of the central decumanus. For some eight centuries, the cathedral

<sup>52</sup> Venditti, “Urbanistica,” 680–682.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid, 668–669. Giovanni Vitolo and Rosalba di Meglio argue that the *mercato nuovo* was already established near the port before the Angevins’ arrival, noting that Charles I speaks of it in a royal document of 1270 without describing it as newly created (*Napoli angioino-aragonese. Confraternite ospedali dinamiche politico-sociali* [Salerno, 2003], 60). However, local tradition in the fourteenth century clearly considered it a creation of Charles I: so states the *Cronaca di Partenope*, at chapter 14. On the coastal churches of S. Maria del Carmine (founded by Charles I) and S. Pietro Martire (by Charles II), see Caroline Bruzelius, *The Stones of Naples. Church Building in Angevin Italy, 1266–1343* (New Haven, 2004), 23–25, 96.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 43.

<sup>55</sup> The original Dominican monastery on this site had been founded in 1231, on a spot previously occupied by a small, pre-tenth-century church dedicated to the archangel Michael. See Venditti, “Urbanistica,” 693, 731, 737. Caroline Bruzelius mentions only an unnamed “hospital and monastery” on the site before it was ceded to the Dominicans; I follow her dates on the new monastery’s construction. See *Stones of Naples*, 95–96. Charles II’s new nomenclature for the church was never widely adopted: see Katherine Jansen, *The Making of the Magdalen. Preaching and Popular Devotion in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton, 2000), 320.

had consisted of two adjacent basilicas—the fourth-century Santa Restituta and a larger basilica known as the Stefania after its founder, bishop Stephen I (499–504).<sup>56</sup> Either in response to damage by an earthquake, or by the choice of royal and episcopal leaders, the Stefania was torn down and work began on a new cathedral.<sup>57</sup> The new structure was not only much larger but reoriented ninety degrees, and thus called for the eventual destruction of the adjacent Santa Restituta, which would soon stand in the way of the planned nave. This enlarged cathedral was “the centerpiece of the urban renewal of Naples, part of the larger project to confirm the city’s status as the new capital of the truncated kingdom;” it was also, from the outset, intended as a royal necropolis for the Angevin crown.<sup>58</sup>

The third and largest Angevin project in the old city was the creation of the Clariss convent of Santa Chiara, begun by Robert’s queen Sancia while the cathedral was still under construction in 1310. A frequent site of royal ceremonial and a newly favored location for royal remains, Santa Chiara “may have been part of a larger movement to pull the center of attention in Naples toward the southwest, away from the old core of the city towards the new elite headquarters around Castel Nuovo and the arsenal.”<sup>59</sup> Underscoring this new axis, the city gate beside Santa Chiara became known as the “Royal Gate”: the old city opened, at Santa Chiara, toward its new rulers and their headquarters.<sup>60</sup> Indeed, Santa Chiara was so imposing a presence on the urban landscape and so profoundly royal in its character that Caroline Bruzelius has perceived an implicit rivalry between it and the traditional symbol of civic identity, the cathedral, especially in their respective belltowers: “if there were power politics to be played out behind the programs of the cathedral and Santa Chiara in Naples, the two unfinished towers ... might have been ambitious and doomed attempts to claim primacy and authority.”<sup>61</sup> Nor were San Domenico, Santa Chiara, and the rebuilt cathedral the only Angevin

---

<sup>56</sup> Nicola Cilento, “La Chiesa di Napoli dell’alto medioevo,” in *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 2 (Naples, 1969), 673–674.

<sup>57</sup> The traditional explanation for the cathedral’s rebuilding, an earthquake of 1293, has been called into question by Caroline Bruzelius: see *Stones of Naples*, 80.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 79

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 153.

<sup>60</sup> Mario Napoli, “La città,” in *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 2, part 2 (Naples, 1969), 748. Napoli suggests that this is the same gate identified in 992 as the “Porta Romana,” and simply renamed under Charles II, when it is first attested as the “Porta Reale.”

<sup>61</sup> Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 153.

building projects in the old center: between the 1270s and the 1340s the crown founded or rebuilt four more mendicant houses in or at the edges of the old city.<sup>62</sup>

Meanwhile, non-Neapolitans who had achieved high positions in the royal administration made their new status known through their own building projects in the old city. The grand chancellor Ingherammo Stella founded a hospital and chapel located near the university, including a chapel dedicated to the Angevin prince and saint Louis of Anjou; the realm's protonotary and logothete, Bartolomeo da Capua, founded S. Maria di Montevergine, enlarged the Franciscan church of San Lorenzo on the ancient forum (where he displayed his coat of arms on its façade) and financed the construction of parts of San Domenico and Sant'Agostino as well.<sup>63</sup> Great officers of the realm also sometimes acquired imposing personal residences in the old city.<sup>64</sup> Encroachment on the oldest and most "patrician" area of Naples, by the crown and by its foreign officers, was an inescapable fact in the early fourteenth century.

Local response to the crown's physical and cultic alterations of the Neapolitan landscape was varied. Some patrician Neapolitans clearly adopted the new "Angevin" saints. Matteo Caracciolo-Carafa founded a church to the Magdalen on land he owned at Tripergole near Pozzuoli, to the delight of Charles II who donated land in 1309 for the construction of an adjacent hospital.<sup>65</sup> The Brancaccio founded a chapel dedicated to Mary Magdalen in the rebuilt church of San Domenico in the city itself.<sup>66</sup> Yet there are signs of diffidence to these new cults as well. As Katherine Jansen has observed, the new nomenclature assigned by Charles II to the church of San Domenico never took root: rejecting the dedication to Mary Magdalen, the local population continued to call it by its earlier name. Nor did Neapolitans (or other southern Italians, for that

---

<sup>62</sup> These were S. Agostino, S. Maria Donnaregina, S. Maria Maddalena, and S. Maria Egiziaca. See Venditti, "Urbanistica," 694–695, and Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 25–27, 99–103, 142.

<sup>63</sup> Ingherammo's foundation is noted by Monti, "L'età angioina," 107, and by Vitolo and di Meglio, *Napoli angioino-aragonese*, 83, both citing M. Camera, *Annali*, vol. 2, 68 and note. On Bartolomeo da Capua's patronage, see Venditti, "Urbanistica," 694–695, and Bruzelius, 26, 67, 159–161.

<sup>64</sup> For instance, the large complexes near San Domenico on the lower decumanus possessed by Diego de la Rath, grand chamberlain of the realm, and Adam de Dussiac, grand chancellor, in the early 1320s: see Vitale, *Élite burocratica*, 136, 137n.

<sup>65</sup> Scipione Ammirato, *Delle famiglie nobili napoletane* (Florence, 1580), vol. 2, 140.

<sup>66</sup> Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 312, 317.



matter) adopt “Maddalena” as a name for their daughters, unlike their counterparts in central and northern Italy where the name became quite popular.<sup>67</sup> Similarly, the cult of Louis of Anjou was much more popular in this era in Provence and central and northern Italy than it was in the south, where it seems to have fared better after the Angevin era than during it.<sup>68</sup>

At the same time, Neapolitans took new steps to refurbish quite ancient cult centers in the city. The nunnery of Santa Patrizia, whose origins stretched back to the seventh century, reached its “maximum splendor” under its patrician abbess Maria Capece (1316–1326) thanks to generous donations by the city’s patriciate, and was duly featured in the *Cronaca di Partenope*’s survey of Naples’ most important religious institutions.<sup>69</sup> Januarius’ original cult center, centered on the catacombs north of the city, was rebuilt and restaffed, after centuries of neglect, from the 1350s forward.<sup>70</sup> A small church dedicated to Agrippinus, an important patron saint of Naples, had stood in his native quarter of Forcella since the ninth century, but had fallen into disrepair; between the 1260s and mid-fourteenth century it was completely restored, presumably by families of the neighborhood.<sup>71</sup> For San Pietro a Fusariello, another old church dedicated to the apostle remembered in local legend as having personally converted Naples to Christianity, we have more solid evidence of local families’ responsibility for its reconstruction in 1293 and enlargement four decades later. An inscription in the church, remembered in local histories from at least the seventeenth century, attributes the work to one Pietro Procolo and to the six neighborhood families to whom he entrusted its care. Known as the “Aquarie” families after their swampy neighborhood (and so remembered, too, in the *Cronaca di Partenope*), they

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 320.

<sup>68</sup> Émile Bertaux, “Les saints Louis dans l’art italien,” *Revue des deux mondes* 158 (1900), 610–664. Outside the Angevins’ own foundations to Louis, southern Italy produced very few under their dominion: Bertaux notes a chapel in Bari and a monastery in Aversa, to which we might add the foundation by Ingherammo Stella in Naples itself. The examples he gives for the Aragonese era are, in fact, more numerous: see esp. 639–640.

<sup>69</sup> Facchiano, *Monasteri femminili*, 18, 21.

<sup>70</sup> Venditti, “Urbanistica,” 696, dates this rebuilding to the late fourteenth century. The sixteenth-century Jesuit chronicler Giovanni Francesco Araldo, however, notes its “foundation” (presumably reconstruction and new staffing) in 1353, when six priests and two deacons were assigned to it. See the edition of his work by Francesco Divenuto, *Napoli sacra del XVI secolo. Repertorio ... nella Cronaca del Gesuita G.F. Araldo* (Naples, 1990), 152.

<sup>71</sup> Venditti, “Urbanistica,” 728–729.

seem to have been wealthy *popolani*, suggesting that local activity in revitalizing local cult centers was not restricted to patrician elites.<sup>72</sup>

Such efforts may denote a kind of local cooperation in the Angevins' project to beautify and transform the city, or at least a keener local pride inspired by Naples' new status as capital. They might also express a resistance to changes in the physical and cultic landscape, an effort to reassert Naples' traditional patron saints and churches. Certainly the *Cronaca di Partenope*, though composed by a patrician entrenched in royal service and dedicated to the king himself, displays a notably conservative attitude toward the religious and secular transformations of the previous half-century. All the saints honored in the refurbished ancient churches named above feature prominently in the *Cronaca*: Peter, hailed as the apostolic founder of Neapolitan Christianity; Patrizia, identified as niece to none other than the emperor Constantine; and Agrippinus and Januarius, patron saints noted for their miraculous protection of Neapolitans. By contrast, the new churches and chapels dedicated to dynastic saints like Louis of Anjou and Mary Magdalen are never mentioned. Indeed, when Bartolomeo came to mention Louis among the children of Charles II, he did not describe his career or recent canonization, remarking only, and not very accurately, that Charles II's second-born son was "saint Louis of France."

Similarly, the physical environment of Naples appears in the *Cronaca* as if the enormous transformations of recent decades had hardly occurred. In his descriptive tour of the ancient city center in chapters 13–15, Bartolomeo makes no mention of the new or enlarged mendicant houses now so prominent along them: San Domenico, Santa Chiara, Santa Maria Donnaregina, San Pietro a Majella, Sant'Agostino, and so on. As for secular structures, he calls the gate at the west end of the lower decumanus the *Porta Ventosa*, and not the *Porta Reale* or "Royal Gate," as it had been called, at least by the royal government, for half a century. He does not mention that the city walls had been extended since ancient times to include the lower city, nor that Angevin-ordered

---

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 750. Cesare d'Engenio Caracciolo states that Pietro Procolo founded rather than rebuilt the church, and cites from the inscription to name the six families to whom he entrusted its care: Macedona del Leone, Dura, Gennara, Pappacoda, Venata, and Strambona. See his *Napoli sacra* (Naples, 1623), 452–453. This account was repeated by Carlo de Lellis, *Discorsi delle famiglie nobili del Regno di Napoli* (Naples, 1654), vol. 2, 307. A sense of these families' status can be gleaned from the careers of the Pappacoda: see above, n. 3. The *Cronaca di Partenope* noted the name of the neighborhood and the families there resident as "Acquaro": see chapter 13 of the following edition.

land reclamation had made habitable its formerly swampy edges: in Bartolomeo's mental topography, beyond the lower decumanus one was "outside the walls," knee-deep in standing water.<sup>73</sup>

It is true that Bartolomeo was describing the ancient city in these chapters, but his conservatism was clearly not an attempt at historical accuracy. In recounting the ancient foundation of his own *seggio* of Nido, Bartolomeo was perfectly happy to feature the university located in its district, though it was a thirteenth-century creation. Furthermore, had he wished to reserve discussion of recent changes to their appropriate place in the narrative's historical progression, we would expect to find them in the final, "royal" section of the work, among the notable deeds of the first three Angevin kings. He does mention a few: Charles II's creation of the new wharf, and, under Robert, the foundation of Santa Chiara, the construction of the castle of Sant'Elmo, and the beautiful paintings in the chapel of Castel Nuovo. Given how much more extensive Angevin building projects were, and how profoundly they shifted the political and economic centers of the city, these few references startle in their incompleteness. The building of Castel Nuovo itself, not to mention the princely palaces, the Vicarial Tribunal, the arsenal, the whole new district rising up on the southwest shore; the expansion and more dense settlement of the port area; the very fact that the Angevins had made Naples the realm's capital—all this is utterly absent from Bartolomeo's account of the city, whose center remains, as it had been before the Angevins' arrival, the ancient center city dominated by patrician families of Capuana and Nido. The erasure of change is most startling in Bartolomeo's description of the cathedral. Its profound transformation could hardly have escaped notice. Yet Bartolomeo makes no mention whatever of its reconstruction or altered form: the Stefania and Santa Restituta appear in the *Cronaca* as if they were still the parallel basilicas they had been before 1294.

With regard to devotional life, this conservatism can be partially attributed to Bartolomeo's heavy reliance on a slightly earlier Neapolitan text, a liturgical compilation known as the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio*, which had in turn recycled early-medieval hagiographical literature. To note this, however, is simply to affirm that devotional traditionalism was not unique to Bartolomeo, but shared by others (here,

---

<sup>73</sup> On the extension of the city's southern walls, see Vitolo and di Meglio, *Napoli angioino-aragonese*, 52–63, who note successive extensions from the eleventh to the later thirteenth century but, in contrast to earlier scholars, date Angevin activity on these walls to after 1350.

the cathedral clergy) in Bartolomeo's time. Indeed, the *SMP*, with its celebration of the glorious, ancient origins of the cathedral, was almost certainly composed as a riposte to the recent demolition of the Stefania and as a plea for the preservation of the adjacent S. Restituta (a successful plea, as it turned out: Santa Restituta was eventually incorporated as an outsized chapel on the new nave's north aisle).<sup>74</sup>

All told, the *Cronaca di Partenope* aptly reflects the complicated and still fluid sociopolitical terrain of early-fourteenth-century Naples, and the ways that the civic elite sought to navigate it. Bartolomeo at times adopted what appears to be a very pro-royal outlook, devoting the final section of his work entirely to the succession of southern-Italian kings and thereby treating their exploits as essentially synonymous with Neapolitan history. Such a stance was fully in keeping with his career as a royal official, and with the more general efforts of his status-group to exploit to the full the crown's presence in the city. At other moments his outlook is quite narrowly patrician, dismissing rival elements of civic society and civic space as inferior to his own. At yet others he champions a broadly civic identity against "foreign contamination," and seeks to preserve a memory of Naples' physical and cultic landscape as if time had stopped well before the Angevins' arrival. These different outlooks could converge or contradict each other, in virtually innumerable combinations. The approving eye cast on foreign men's elevation to comital status was both a patrician characteristic and implicitly a pro-royal one; the denigration of "contaminating" foreigners could apply both to non-noble denizens from nearby towns, again reflecting patrician superiority, and to more distant immigrants associated with the crown, against whom all locals could unite. Who and what constituted "Neapolitaness" remained confusingly, even dizzyingly, in flux, and the *Cronaca* is a testament to that uncertainty.

### *The Cultural Landscape*

It should perhaps come as no surprise that the fluid situation in which Bartolomeo and his peers found themselves in the early decades of the fourteenth century inspired the genesis of a new genre, Neapolitan vernacular history. Gabrielle Spiegel has charted a comparable genesis

---

<sup>74</sup> On the cathedral's initial plan and the later decision to preserve Santa Restituta, see Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 83–85, 91.

in early-thirteenth-century northern France. Faced with an expanding royal power that threatened both their political autonomy and their vision of an aristocratic past that “explained” their power and greatness, the provincial nobility sponsored the creation of a new genre, vernacular prose historiography, that could enshrine their nostalgia for the past and shore up their group identity in the present.<sup>75</sup> The *Cronaca di Partenope* was the product of a similar social group, one whose local pre-eminence was shaken by the arrival in Naples of the crown and all its hangers-on. Patrician preeminence would soon be re-established, and on an even larger playing field, as elite Neapolitan families penetrated the feudal hierarchy and asserted sway in both the kingdom’s capital and its provinces. Perhaps affirmations of group identity such as the *Cronaca* contributed to their successful negotiation of the new socio-political order, both in affirming the value of their Neapolitan heritage and in defining “Neapolitaness” itself so flexibly as to accommodate the shifting roles they themselves adopted. As the catalyst for the major changes in Naples’ social-political makeup, the establishment of the royal dynasty in Naples was crucial to the creation of the *Cronaca di Partenope*. Despite Bartolomeo’s significant erasure of Angevin-era changes to the physical and cultic fabric of the city, despite the fact that he devoted four-fifths of his narrative to Naples’ history before a king ever set foot in southern Italy, the Angevins’ arrival in Naples created the psychic and social conditions without which the *Cronaca*’s composition could not have been conceived and executed.

The Angevins created the conditions for Bartolomeo’s work in another sense too: by providing, directly and indirectly, the cultural tools necessary for the *Cronaca*’s composition. One was the enthusiasm for classical antiquity that took root in Naples during the reign of King Robert.<sup>76</sup> The king himself demonstrated his interest in antiquity by acquiring an early copy of the long-lost fourth decade of Livy’s *Ab urbe condita* and other

---

<sup>75</sup> Gabrielle Spiegel, *Romancing the Past. The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1993), where this argument is summarized on 4–6.

<sup>76</sup> Such classical learning had also been evident in Campania under Frederick II in the early thirteenth century, as witnessed by the works of Piero della Vigna and Peter of Eboli, but thereafter went into decline: as Francesco Sabatini has observed, “la cultura latina propriamente letteraria [i.e. excluding theology and law] fu in sostanza assente a Napoli fino alla piena età di Roberto”: “Le origini della letteratura volgare napoletana: Dal rifiuto dei siciliani all’imitazione dei modelli centrali,” in *Omaggio a Camillo Guerrieri-Crocetti* (Genoa, 1971), 460.

works on Roman history.<sup>77</sup> The prestige accorded to classical learning was widely publicized by Petrarch's visit in 1341, when Robert administered a three-day "examination" of Petrarch's worthiness of the poet's laurel and Petrarch dedicated to Robert his Virgil-inspired Latin epic, the *Africa*. Similar classical interests can be detected among the king's educated personnel, such as Paolo da Perugia, a rather low-ranking chapel cleric who wrote a commentary on Persius and an account of the Greco-Roman gods, and at the outer fringes of court life—but close to the beating heart of civic life—in Boccaccio himself, who during his thirteen years in Naples not only frequented Paolo da Perugia, whose work was an inspiration for his own *De genealogia deorum gentilium*, but translated Valerius Maximus and some of Livy.<sup>78</sup> This vogue for antiquity became part of Neapolitan culture. In the early fourteenth century, as we have seen, it inspired a verse translation of Peter of Eboli's account of the region's ancient baths, one of the first works rendered in the Neapolitan vernacular. In the 1340s it produced a local Latin compendium of classical notices about Naples, Campania, and more distant regions, which was to serve as one of Bartolomeo's principal sources for the ancient history of the city.<sup>79</sup> And it informed Bartolomeo's own undertaking, which differed notably from its only historiographical predecessor, the ninth-century *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum*, by incorporating the city's and region's pre-Christian heritage.

After Petrarch's visit, native sons appear to have adopted this classical enthusiasm in greater numbers: Giovanni Barrile, Barbato da Sulmona, and Niccolò d'Alife all corresponded with Petrarch and attempted their own Latin compositions in following years.<sup>80</sup> It seems quite clear, however, that the pioneers of this classicizing vogue in Naples were northern Italians such as Paola da Perugia and Boccaccio, and that the example and influence of another northern Italian, Petrarch himself, did much

---

<sup>77</sup> Cornelia Coulter, "The Library of the Angevin Kings of Naples," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 75 (1944), 148; Camillo Minieri-Riccio, "Genealogia di Carlo II d'Angiò re di Napoli," *ASPN* 7 (1882), 683. See S. Kelly, *The New Solomon*, 46–47 on the significance of the acquisition of Livy.

<sup>78</sup> Francesco Torraca, "Giovanni Boccaccio a Napoli," *ASPN* 39 (1914), 229–267 (who notes on 242 that Boccaccio cites Paolo eighty times in the *Genealogia*); M.T. Casella, "Nuovi appunti attorno a Boccaccio traduttore di Livio," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 4 (1961), 77–129, and idem, "Il volgarizzamento di Valerio Massimo dal Lancia al Boccaccio," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 6 (1963), 49–136.

<sup>79</sup> This work, which I call "Commentary V," will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

<sup>80</sup> Sabatini, *Napoli angioina*, 80–82.

to intensify it. It is worth calling attention to this direction of influence, for northern Italy, and particularly Florence, seems to have played a role as well in the genesis of Neapolitan as a literary language, and hence in Bartolomeo's decision to write his new history in his local idiom.

As Francesco Sabatini has convincingly demonstrated, Campania in the early Trecento had no longstanding tradition of vernacular writing, even for prosaic purposes such as mercantile records or notarial documents. Not surprisingly, self-consciously literary compositions in the vernacular were equally scarce.<sup>81</sup> The very late thirteenth or early fourteenth century has left us two short poems in Neapolitan by the so-called "Abbate di Napoli," while the early fourteenth century produced translations of two Latin works celebrating the region's heritage, Peter of Eboli's *De balneis puteolarum* and a Salernitan medical work, the *Regimen Sanitatis*. The quite different status of the vernacular in Florence, and the number of instantly famous, original vernacular literary works produced there in the early fourteenth century, are too well known to require emphasis. I should like only to recall Giovanni Villani's *Nuova Cronica*, built on an already firm foundation of previous Florentine vernacular histories and widely circulated in the early decades of the century, because the later evolution of the *Cronaca* became so intertwined with it. Given the intensive contacts between Florence and Naples in the late thirteenth and especially fourteenth century—the signories that Charles I and Robert held in Florence, the two-year sojourn of Robert's son and his entourage of young Neapolitan knights between 1326 and 1328, as well as the conspicuous presence of Florentines in Neapolitan economic and political life—there is every reason to believe that the prestige enjoyed by the vernacular in Florence was known in the Angevin capital, and contributed to the new embrace of the vulgar tongue there. Indeed there is proof of the influence, for as Francesco Sabatini has observed, the earliest Neapolitan vernacular works—the poems of the "Abbate di Napoli" and the translations of Peter of Eboli and the *Regimen Sanitatis*—all utilize Tuscan poetic genres or a "Tuscanized" Neapolitan idiom.<sup>82</sup> The point for present purposes is that the intimate political and economic links with Florence established by the Angevins were an indirect but decisive factor

---

<sup>81</sup> "Fino al cadere del Duecento, forse fino all'inizio del Trecento, mancò a Napoli e in Campania (se si esclude, come si deve, la limitrofa ma estranea area cassinese) una letteratura volgare autoctona e perfino una tradizione di volgare documentario": Sabatini, "Le origini," 472.

<sup>82</sup> Sabatini, *Napoli angioina*, 43–45.

in the development of Neapolitan as a literary language. They provided the cultural conditions necessary for Bartolomeo to conceive of composing a history of his city in the vernacular.

It was the culturally different context of Joanna I's reign, however, that made it possible for Bartolomeo to dedicate his vernacular history to the king. Robert of Anjou may have cultivated an environment favorable to research into the classical past and solidified a Florentine (and more generally northern Italian) connection where both classicizing and vernacular traditions flourished. But he neither spoke any Italian idiom nor envisaged its employment as an official language of state. His culture was very markedly Latin, and what few vernacular works are found among his acquisitions were in northern French.<sup>83</sup> His successor's situation was quite different. Joanna I was born and raised in Naples, as were her cousins of the Taranto and Durazzo lines who vied to dominate both her and the realm. Neapolitan was their native tongue. And for the first time, under the joint rule of Joanna I and Louis of Taranto, the local vernacular (again in a Tuscanized form) was utilized for some official correspondence.<sup>84</sup> If the Tuscan precedent cracked open the door to local vernacular literature in Naples, the Neapolitan idiom's embrace by the crown, as Francesco Sabatini has observed, opened it wide. For the first time, an educated local elite saw its own culture reflected in the crown, its own language that of the highest circles of power and patronage. The *Cronaca's* preponderant emphasis on Naples' pre-royal past and pre-Angevin physiognomy should not obscure the decisive role that the Angevin establishment in Naples had on its existence.

In briefly tracing the social, political, urbanistic, and cultural context of the early Angevin age I hope to have pointed up the dynamics that informed Bartolomeo's experience and made possible his work. Those dynamics were complicated. They created shifting and sometimes surprising alliances and fissures; they promised both opportunities and loss. But above all they promised rather than delivered: what Neapolitan identity would be and who would carry its banner, above all (from a patrician viewpoint) what position its traditional elites would play in its future, were as yet unsettled questions. The *Cronaca di Partenope* is an eloquent reflection of its time precisely in articulating this ambiguity. It adopted a perspective that was alternately civic, royal, narrowly patrician, and aspiring to feudal. It set the borders of Neapolitaness at the

---

<sup>83</sup> Coulter, "Library of the Angevin Kings," 141–155.

<sup>84</sup> Sabatini, *Napoli angioina*, 129–130.



edges of the ancient city, and stretched them throughout and beyond the realm. It expressed this Neapolitan identity in a Neapolitan idiom, but one inspired by a “foreign,” Tuscan model. Throughout, it expressed at once the anxiety and the excitement sparked by Naples’ elevation to the role of realmwide capital.

## chapter four

### SOURCES AND ADAPTATIONS

Many of the textual sources employed in the *Cronaca di Partenope* have been identified by previous scholars, though without distinguishing between those Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa consulted directly and those he cited via an intermediate source, and without comparing the *Cronaca*'s narration with them to determine the extent and nature of the borrowing. In the "Historical Notes and Sources" appendix to the edition, the specific sources employed for each chapter and the changes wrought to them in both the original *Cronaca* and the revised, Group B version are identified. Here I wish to provide an overview of these sources and their relation to the text of the *Cronaca*. In a few cases both the source itself and its relationship to the *Cronaca* are complex and require more sustained discussion than can be included in the appendix. Further, by reviewing all the sources together we can begin to construct a picture of Bartolomeo's cultural horizons and of the particular interests revealed in his adaptations of his written material.

The following discussion deals in turn with the three chronological sections into which the *Cronaca* fairly neatly divides. The first, treating pagan antiquity, comprises chapters 1–32 (33B); two chronologically misplaced chapters, on the Cumaean sibyl, also belong to this section [38 (39B)–39 (40B)]. The second section treats Naples' early-Christian and early-medieval history, which for brevity's sake I will refer to as its "sacred era," in chapters 33 (34B)–55 (57B), excepting the two chapters on the Cumaean sibyl. The third can be described as a narration of Naples' royal era, since it deals principally with the reigns of the successive kings of southern Italy from the Normans to the accession of Joanna I (chapter 56 [58B] to the end), though its first few chapters describe the various lords of southern Italy before the arrival of the Normans and the careers of the early Normans before they held the status of king. Full bibliographical citations on the *Cronaca*'s source texts are offered chapter by chapter in Appendix I, and will therefore not be repeated here.

*Pagan Antiquity*

Bartolomeo's first identifiable source on Naples' classical past is also the most difficult to treat, due both to its own fragmentary nature and uncertain identity, and to its complicated relationship with the *Cronaca*. It is a Latin compilation now preserved only in a fifteenth-century manuscript (Naples, Biblioteca nazionale, IX C 24) at fols. 89<sup>r</sup>–123<sup>v</sup>. There is no title or introduction indicating the nature of the work, for, as an early foliation attests, the manuscript is missing the two folios immediately preceding 89<sup>r</sup>, which must have contained the beginning of this work. The surviving text begins mid-sentence with an account of the people of Cumae on the Bay of Naples and their migration to Parthenope, later called Neapolis. There follows a jumble of classical references to Parthenope/Neapolis (as well as medieval legends about Virgil's benefactions to the city) and to its sister city Palaepolis. The text then treats other nearby sites—*Mons Massicus*, Arunca, *Sidicinum*, Volturno, Capua—with a similar collection of classical notices, and continues with more distant sites, from Grosseto to Crete and Sicily. A long discussion of classical heroes and gods occupies folios 94<sup>r</sup> to 111<sup>v</sup>. The text then returns to a description of particular places stretching from the Roman campagna to Sicily (fols. 111<sup>v</sup>–120<sup>v</sup>), and concludes with more identification of ancient heroes and gods (fols. 121<sup>r</sup>–123<sup>v</sup>).

A rapid survey of this text persuaded Gennaro Maria Monti in the 1930s that it was a commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid*.<sup>1</sup> Livio Petrucci seconded this identification in 1981, when he noted that the sequence of sites in IX C 24 that starts with *Mons Massicus* (fol. 90<sup>v</sup>) exactly matches that of the *Aeneid* VII: 725–740.<sup>2</sup> As is clear from the brief description above, however, the text is certainly not a “Virgil commentary” in the usual sense of that term, that is, a gloss of Virgil's verses used primarily to explicate grammar, of which the most famous and widely used were those of Servius and Donatus. The text in IX C 24 corresponds only to select passages of the *Aeneid*, which do not appear in their original order, and it does not seek to explicate Virgil's grammar or syntax. Instead, it traces

<sup>1</sup> Gennaro Maria Monti, “La ‘Cronaca di Partenope’ (Premessa all'edizione critica),” in idem, *Dai normanni agli aragonesi* (Trani, 1936), 57, with a transcription of one paragraph of the work on 60.

<sup>2</sup> Livio Petrucci, “Lasciti della prima circolazione della ‘Genealogia deorum gentilium’ in un manoscritto campano del Quattrocento,” *Studi mediolatini e volgari* 27 (1980–1981), 163–181, at 166.

a geographical itinerary, focused mostly on southern Italy and with particular attention to Campania.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, it culls citations and anecdotes related to these places from a wide variety of classical texts, as well as from medieval authors. It might therefore best be described as an encyclopedia of classical quotations (and medieval legends of antiquity) about the region, though one that probably took the *Aeneid* as its starting point. Indeed, we will see in a moment that even the earliest folios of this text may have developed from Virgilian verses.

The earliest surviving folios (89<sup>r</sup>–90<sup>v</sup>) treat Naples and its sister city Palaepolis, and have many correspondences with the *Cronaca*. The narrative tells of the people of Cumae discovering the body (i.e. tomb) of Parthenope, migrating temporarily to this site due to a pestilence in Cumae, then settling permanently in Parthenope after a second pestilence strikes Cumae. With this second migration Parthenope takes the name “new city” (Neapolis). All this corresponds fairly closely to chapters 3–5 of the *Cronaca*. The two works also share many of the same references to textual authorities: “Lactantius” (crossed out and replaced by “Lucretius” in IX C 24, but actually Lutatius)<sup>4</sup> on Cumaeans settling Parthenope; brief citations from Ovid, Seneca, and Virgil regarding Naples, as well as similar biographical information on Virgil; and a citation of the thirteenth-century southern Italian poet Eustazio da Matera’s *Planctus Italie* describing Naples as a “royal city.” Both include legends of Virgil’s magical benefactions to the city of Naples; both, in the legend of the magic horse, mention a distych composed by King Charles I about this horse, a story that comes, again, from Eustazio da Matera. Both cite Alexander (Neckam) as a source on the legends. Finally, both repeat, at the end of their respective surveys of Naples’ origins, the information found in Livy that the Cumaeans traced their

---

<sup>3</sup> In total, of 36 geographical entries, thirteen are Campanian (Naples, Palaepolis, *Massicus mons*, Arunca, *Sidicinum*, *Cales*, Capua, Capri, Ischia, *Aminternum*, Nola, Averno, Cumae), three more are identified as Campanian (*Foronia fons*, Terracina, and *Ufens fluvius*), and ten more are located in southern Italy (Sicily, Gabi, Eboli, the Lipari islands, Messina, Aetna, Sicily again, Crotona, Salento, *Brutium*, Taranto). Of the remaining ten sites, eight are in central Italy (Grosseto, Alba, Sabina, Fidena, *Algidiro mons*, Nurisia, Aricia, [Monte] Circeo) while two are more distant islands (Sardinia and Crete).

<sup>4</sup> The *Cronaca* refers to this author as Lactantius, as have modern scholars in their lists of the work’s sources. IX C 24 also writes Lactantius, corrected to Lucretius. The context of the reference—the origins of the Greek settlers of Naples/Palaepolis—indicates that the intended author was Lutatius, whose lost *Historia communis* was cited by later commentators on Virgil’s *Georgics* on this fact. I thank T. Corey Brennan for helping me identify this reference.

origins to Calcis and Euboea in Greece and settled first on Aenaria (in Greek, Pithecusae; now Ischia) in the Bay of Naples before moving to the mainland.

Despite the obvious relationship between these texts, the work in IX C 24 cannot have been Bartolomeo's source, as G.M. Monti proposed, for it was certainly composed later. As Livio Petrucci discovered, the middle section on classical gods and heroes (fols. 94<sup>r</sup> to the middle of 111<sup>v</sup>) is a long excerpt from a copy of Boccaccio's *De genealogia deorum gentilium* that was annotated in Naples in the 1370s.<sup>5</sup> This excerpt begins on a fresh folio and its end is marked off from the subsequent text by a break of several blank lines, but Boccaccio is cited both before and after this excerpt (on fols. 93<sup>r</sup> and 123<sup>v</sup>), indicating that the whole text was composed, or at least reworked, well after Bartolomeo's death in 1362. Nor, despite the *Cronaca*'s earlier date, can it have been the source for the similar passages in IX C 24. This is clearest in the Virgilian legends, where IX C 24 accurately cites Latin passages from Alexander Neckam and John of Salisbury. The *Cronaca*, instead, offers much altered versions, in translation, and it is extremely unlikely that the author of the text in IX C 24 discovered these stories in the *Cronaca* and then went back to the originals (which in the case of John of Salisbury is not even mentioned) to copy their Latin text.

The only reasonable explanation for the relationship between the text in IX C 24 and the *Cronaca* is that both drew on a common source: an earlier work similar to that found in IX C 24 (i.e., a Campanian-centered collection of classical notices inspired by the *Aeneid*), which I will call "Commentary V" to recall its previous characterization as a Virgil commentary. This original must have been composed after about 1270 because of its citations from Eustazio's *Planctus*, a pro-Staufen lament of the Angevin conquest of the realm.<sup>6</sup> Its firm *terminus ante quem* is the date of the *Cronaca*'s completion (1348–1350).

---

<sup>5</sup> In fact, Petrucci was able to identify it as an excerpt of an early draft of the *Genealogia*: one that included commentary added before February 1372 by Pietro da Monterone to a copy Boccaccio had left in Naples, but that lacked the further emendations Boccaccio himself made to the final version. See "Lasciti," 168–176.

<sup>6</sup> Bartolomeo Capasso first noted a reference in this work to Petrarch as "nuper romae laurea insignatus," and hence dated it to shortly after 1341; the dating was repeated by Monti ("La 'Cronaca,'" 57) and Sabatini (*Napoli angioina*, 136). These scholars all wrote before Petrucci recognized the excerpts from Boccaccio and pushed the date of composition forward. The reference to Petrarch is in fact part of the interpolation from the *De genealogia deorum* (Book XV, chapter 6: "Franciscum Petrarcham . . . nuper Romae

The existence of “Commentary V” explains the Boccaccio material in IX C 24 as a later interpolation, which disrupts the otherwise geographical organization of the text. More importantly for present purposes, it explains the origin not only of the passages shared by IX C 24 and the *Cronaca*, but probably of other classical episodes found in the *Cronaca* alone. As mentioned above, the earliest surviving folio of IX C 24 corresponds to the narration in the *Cronaca* chapters 3–5. The subject matter of the *Cronaca* chapters 1 and 2, though not found in IX C 24, is closely related, for it recounts the earlier history of the Cumaeans: their origins in Greece and migration to Ischia and then Cumae, and Daedalus’ construction of a temple to Apollo on Cumae’s heights. As episodes immediately preceding and explaining the Cumaeans’ presence in the Bay of Naples—a presence with which the acephalous text of IX C 24 opens—it seems likely that such material occupied the initial, missing folios of Commentary V. Indeed, there is a clear echo of “Commentary V” in the first chapter of the *Cronaca*. Bartolomeo here cites Livy’s *Ab urbe condita* on the Cumaeans’ Greek origins and arrival in Italy. Bartolomeo cites this same passage of Livy (VIII: 21) again in chapter 8, and because the citation here is more exact, we can see that it was drawn from “Commentary V.”<sup>7</sup>

Furthermore, the references to Daedalus and Apollo in these earliest *Cronaca* chapters, as well as their connection not only to Cumae but to Calcis and Euboea, suggest a relationship with the *Aeneid* VI: 1–19. In fact, these *Aeneid* verses are themselves featured in the *Cronaca*, and represent one of the few textual citations Bartolomeo preserved in the original Latin. Since we know that IX C 24 corresponds to a different passage of the *Aeneid* starting at folio 90<sup>v</sup>, it is reasonable to assume that its first three and a half folios (of which we now possess only the last folio and a half) were similarly oriented around *Aeneid* VI: 1–19, whose subject is, again, Campania. In that case not only chapters 3–5, but the first five chapters of the *Cronaca in toto* were culled from this narration. A last trace of the relationship between the *Cronaca* and an exposition of *Aeneid* VI: 1–19 appears in chapters 38 and 39 (39B–40B), which discuss the Cumaean sibyl. Though this episode appears out of chronological order in the *Cronaca*, the fact that it was included at all suggests a source

---

... ab ipsis senatoribus laurea insignitum”). It cannot, therefore, tell us anything about the date of the text Bartolomeo consulted, which could have been composed anytime during Angevin rule prior to Bartolomeo’s own composition.

<sup>7</sup> See Appendix I at notes to chapter 8 for the quotation.

engaged with Naples' classical past; and since the Cumaean sibyl figures in the *Aeneid* VI: 1–19, these chapters too may be a last borrowing from the lost early folios of Commentary V.

While Cumae figured in the description of Naples in “Commentary V,” it also earned an entry of its own much later in the work (fol. 119<sup>r-v</sup>), and here too we find passages borrowed by the *Cronaca*. For instance, this entry states that Cumae took its name from a pregnant woman and offers a Greek etymology of the name Cumae, as in the *Cronaca* at chapter 1. This entry also cites or paraphrases lines from the *Aeneid* VI: 1–19 regarding Daedalus and makes mention of the Cumaean sibyl, echoing the *Cronaca*'s Latin quotation of the *Aeneid* VI:1–19 and its mention of Daedalus (in chapter 2) and its later chapters on the Cumaean sibyl. If this entry on Cumae were Bartolomeo's source, he must have looked further for his direct quotation of the *Aeneid* and his text of the sibyl's prophecy. But since “Commentary V” very frequently repeats its classical quotations both within and across its different geographical entries, it seems likely that this same information was provided, in a more detailed form, in the work's lost early folios, and that chapters 1–5, as well as 38–39 (39B–40B), all came from this source.

Certainly Bartolomeo read beyond the first, Naples-centered folios of “Commentary V,” for a passage in its later entry on Nola (fol. 114<sup>r</sup>) served as the basis for his narrative in chapter 8. The episode concerns a war waged by Naples-Palaepolis and their nearby allies against Rome, ultimately drawn, as “Commentary V” indicates, from Livy's *Ab urbe condita* (specifically, Book VIII, chapters 22–26). In condensing Livy's much longer account, however, “Commentary V” altered details to make Naples-Palaepolis appear less foolish and helpless, and the *Cronaca* followed “Commentary V” in all these changes. There are clues that Bartolomeo also consulted Livy directly on this siege, as we will see, but his interpretation of it was clearly indebted to this local work.

All told, “Commentary V” accounts for a considerable percentage of the *Cronaca*'s narration of antiquity: the general narrative of chapters 1–5 (Greek migration to the Bay of Naples and eventual settlement of Parthenope), chapter 8 (basic characterization of the Roman siege, as well as a number of short classical citations in the early part of the chapter), parts of chapters 15 and 16 (more short classical quotations), the general subject of 17–19, 21, and 30 (Virgilian legends), parts of 27 and 32 (Virgil's biography), and, if I am correct about the character of the first, lost folios of Commentary V, also chapters 38–39 (the Cumaean sibyl). “Commentary V” also accounts for the majority of textual authorities

cited in the *Cronaca*'s classical section: Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Seneca, "Lactantius," Eustazio da Matera, Alexander Neckam, and Livy (who was also, however, consulted directly).

What alterations Bartolomeo made to this source cannot be determined with certainty, since we can only compare the *Cronaca* with a copy of "Commentary V" that changed after Bartolomeo's time. We are on fairly solid ground in the passages where IX C 24 and the *Cronaca* are very close, however, and these suggest a fair degree of autonomy on Bartolomeo's part.

The quotations from Virgil's *Georgics* and Seneca's *Epistles*, for instance, almost certainly derive from "Commentary V," but are subtly changed in Bartolomeo's treatment. The text in IX C 24 correctly quotes the last lines of the *Georgics*: *Illo Virgilium me tempore dulcis alebat Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis ocii* ("in that time sweet Parthenope nurtured me, languishing in the arts of ignoble ease").<sup>8</sup> When this passage first appears in the *Cronaca* in chapter 5, only the first half is given, in Latin. When the full sentence is translated in chapter 27 (28B), its second half is given a different import: *in quillo tempo simme notricava de la dolce Parthonope, multo nobele in ocio et florido indelo studio*. Thus in Bartolomeo's version, the phrase *studiis florentem ignobilis ocii* describes Parthenope, not Virgil, and Parthenope is not "languishing in the arts (*studiis*) of ignoble ease," but "flourishing in study and very noble in ease." Similarly, Bartolomeo construes a citation from Seneca in a more positive light. Seneca wrote that he was ashamed of humanity every time he entered the school of Naples, because the Neapolitans preferred the theater. The text in IX C 24 gives the Latin passage properly on fol. 90<sup>r</sup>. Bartolomeo, though translating correctly Seneca's shame upon entering the school of Naples, nevertheless focuses only on the mention of schools, claiming on this basis that "Naples has been praised by many prudent men for its high and noble learning, and especially by Seneca" (chapter 15).

Another shared passage regards the origins of Naples, where both texts tell of a double migration from Cumae to Parthenope/Neapolis. In IX C 24, the second migration explains the name "Neapolis," for having been resettled after its brief abandonment, the site was now the "new city."<sup>9</sup> The *Cronaca* preserves the double migration, but without its

<sup>8</sup> IX C 24 cites the passage twice, on fol. 89<sup>v</sup> and on fol. 90<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> For the relevant passage, see Appendix I at notes to chapter 4.



purpose in explaining the name Neapolis. For Bartolomeo, the settlement of Neapolis occurred much later, and the city was located in a different spot, on the other side of Mount Falerno. Their disagreement on this point seems to arise from their different interpretations of a passage from Livy that identified Palaepolis and Neapolis as nearby cities both inhabited by immigrants from Cumae. Commentator V identified Parthenope with Neapolis, and considered Palaepolis a different settlement.<sup>10</sup> Bartolomeo identified Parthenope with Palaepolis, as indeed was more logical for the initial settlement in the area, and therefore offered a quite different, legendary account of the origins of Neapolis, to which we will turn in a moment.

More pronounced are the differences between the Virgilian legends recounted in the two texts. IX C 24 offers a faithful citation of the Latin passages of its sources (John of Salisbury and Alexander Neckam), suggesting that here the extant manuscript is close to the original “Commentary V.” Bartolomeo, though including versions of all five legends found in this work, offered them in a different sequence, dispersed among many other Virgilian legends, and with much-altered details—most notably, a substantially different account of the “fly legend” than that found in IX C 24 and its source, John of Salisbury. While Bartolomeo clearly borrowed heavily from “Commentary V,” therefore, it is also safe to say that he exhibited a good deal of autonomy in his translation of it, altering passages to be more flattering to Naples, “improving” its historical accuracy with regard to Naples’ location, and changing the sequence and content of its Virgilian legends as he saw fit.

Bartolomeo probably also consulted several classical authors directly, though brief references in “Commentary V” very likely inspired him to do so. The first is Livy. The *Cronaca* chapter 8, as we have seen, was heavily influenced by the account of a Roman siege in “Commentary V,” which ultimately came from *Ab urbe condita* VIII: 22–26. But a few details suggest Bartolomeo also consulted Livy’s version directly. For one, he specifies that Philo placed his army between Naples and Palaepolis in order to prevent their mutual aid, a fact observed by Livy but not found in “Commentary V,” at least as we now have the latter. Second, Bartolomeo mentions (at the end of chapter 9) that at this time Alexander founded Alexandria in Egypt. This datum was mentioned by Livy at the

---

<sup>10</sup> IX C 24 treats Palaepolis after Naples, as a different city, and under this rubric cites the relevant passage from Livy on fol. 90<sup>v</sup>: see Appendix I at notes to chapter 8.

start of VIII: 24, in a digression that interrupts his account of the siege of Palaepolis in chapters 22–23 and 25–26. It also is absent from “Commentary V.” Presuming Bartolomeo did read Livy’s original account, it is notable that he chose to hew more closely to the version in “Commentary V,” which both made Naples more central to the action and portrayed its inhabitants in a more flattering light. As for the following *Cronaca* chapter (9), it appears to be based on the same Livian episode, although it is treated here as a separate one. Again the cause of the conflict is Naples’ antagonism to Rome; as in Livy’s account of the Roman siege, Naples’ occupiers treat the citizens most cruelly; and most telling, it is here that Bartolomeo refers to the foundation of Alexandria, which definitively links this chapter to Livy VIII: 22–26. The *Cronaca* adds different details, such as naming the site of the Nolan encampment as “Campo ad Nola” and adding the people of the “Valle de Gaudio” to Naples’ antagonists. Bartolomeo appears therefore to have intended to narrate a distinct episode from that of chapter 8. Later copyists of the *Cronaca*, however, may not have been so sure: whereas some entitled this chapter “How Naples was captured by the Nolans,” others changed “Nolans” to “Romans,” making the two chapters yet more similar.

Chapters 11 and 12 certainly come from Livy, for the events here recounted (Hannibal’s siege of Naples and Naples’ alliance with Rome against him) are not found in “Commentary V” and the *Cronaca*’s narration is very close to *Ab urbe condita* XXIII: 1 and XXII: 32 respectively. The *Cronaca* alters Livy’s narrative in two related ways. First, it places Hannibal’s siege and the Neapolitan embassy to ally with Rome in reverse chronological order. Indeed, the *Cronaca* itself betrays this reversal, by citing “Book Three” of Livy for Hannibal’s siege, and “Book Two” for the embassy. Secondly, it adds a proverb at the start of chapter 12. This proverb, though somewhat obscure, is perhaps best translated as “after having suffered harm, the enraged Neapolitan makes a pact to wreak vengeance.”<sup>11</sup> It therefore creates a causal link between the harm suffered in chapter 11 (Hannibal’s siege) and the pact in chapter 12 (the gift representing solidarity with Rome against Hannibal). In Livy, Naples offers its gifts to Rome first; but when Rome suffers its terrible defeat at the battle of Cannae, the Campanians desert their Roman allies, and face

---

<sup>11</sup> *Po dampno facto, napolitan macto fa pacto*: literally, “after a harm done, the crazed Neapolitan makes a pact.” Given the context, “pact” seems to imply a pact or oath of revenge against the attacker, and not a treaty with the attacker.

Hannibal's attack, which occurred afterward, alone.<sup>12</sup> By placing Naples' alliance with Rome at the very end of this narration, the *Cronaca* omitted Naples' ignominious desertion of an embattled ally. It also portrayed Naples as rich enough, even after Hannibal's siege, to offer succor to a bankrupt Rome, thus becoming Rome's benefactor rather than its faithless friend.

Between these pairs of Livian chapters, the *Cronaca* includes one (chapter 10) borrowed from Valerius Maximus. As with the Livian episode in chapters 8–9, the inclusion of this one may have been inspired by “Commentary V,” which briefly mentions a territorial dispute between Naples and Nola in its Nolan entry.<sup>13</sup> Bartolomeo must have consulted Valerius Maximus directly, however, for he offers a fairly faithful translation of his *Facta et dicta memorabilia* VII: 3, paragraph 4. The story is notable primarily for its inclusion, for here Naples is amenable to peace and the order of law, while Rome violates such agreements. It therefore conformed to Bartolomeo's understandable interest in portraying Naples in a positive light, and perhaps served as a sort of riposte to the negative characterizations of Naples Bartolomeo presumably encountered in perusing Livy.<sup>14</sup>

The third classical author Bartolomeo consulted directly was Lucius Anneus Florus, in chapter 16. Again, he was likely inspired to search out Florus' condensation of Livy, the *Epitomae de Tito Livio bellorum omnium annorum DCC libri II*, because of a brief reference to it in “Commentary V.” In its entry on Capua, “Commentary V” cited Florus on Capua's former preeminence and inclusion (with Rome and Carthage) among the three greatest cities of the world. The *Cronaca* mentions the same fact, but as part of a longer, accurate citation of Florus on the beauties of ancient Campania, including Naples. Finally, the *Cronaca* cites a longer passage of Ovid (in chapter 15) than that found in “Commentary V,” and cites one of Seneca's epistles also lacking from this compendium (in chapter 29

---

<sup>12</sup> Livy narrates their desertion in XXII: 61: “fides sociorum, quae ad eam diem firma steterat, tum labare coepit, nulla profecto alia de re quam quod desperaverant de imperio. Defecere autem ad Poenos hi populi: Campani ....” See the Loeb edition, vol. 5 (Books XXI–XXII), trans. B.O. Foster (Cambridge, MA, 1982), 408.

<sup>13</sup> Following a few lines on the Roman *dictator* Petilius and his capture of Nola, it reads: “Hec ille de dissentione territorii cum neapolitanis et nolans require sibi in Neapolim”: IX C 24, fol. 114<sup>r</sup>. There is nothing further on this conflict, nor a reference to Valerius Maximus.

<sup>14</sup> This chapter does acknowledge that at this time Rome was Naples' overlord, a fact Bartolomeo conveniently forgot in discussing Naples' alliance with Rome in the later chapter 12.

[30B]). While these absences from “Commentary V” may reflect the later version of the text that we possess, it is also plausible that Bartolomeo sought out these well-known classical texts for direct citation.

Unfortunately for Bartolomeo, none of these textual sources had anything specific to say about Naples’ first founder, nor about the physical construction and expansion of the ancient city. Bartolomeo therefore offered his own account, in chapters 6–7 and 13–15. The story of Naples’ first founder, as Bartolomeo attests, grew out of a Greek inscription engraved on the façade of an ancient temple in the city center, later converted into the church of S. Paolo Maggiore. This inscription identified one Tiberius Julius Tarsus as founder of the temple and, as far as Bartolomeo understood it, of the city as a whole.<sup>15</sup> On this basis the *Cronaca* offered a more complete narrative, identifying Tiberius as a young, noble knight of Parthenope disgusted by the infighting in that city who therefore founded the “new city” a short distance away and built its first temple (chapters 6–7). Chapter 13 picks up this thread, crediting Tiberius with creating Naples’ original layout of three principal thoroughfares and building its principal structures. Chapter 14 and the beginning of chapter 15 then describe in greater detail the original six *seggi* of this ancient city center, and the expansion of the city through the immigration of three later settlers, whose names correspond to outlying neighborhoods of the city.

One motive for recounting these legends was surely to provide Naples with an identifiable first founder and to describe the city’s admirably and authentically ancient physical nucleus. Another was to emphasize the greater antiquity and nobility of Naples’ “original” six *seggi* (including Bartolomeo’s own) and to denigrate the *seggi* of Porto and Portanova as inferior by dint of their later foundation and less salubrious location. For present purposes, it is worth mentioning that these legends neither had nor needed a textual source, depending instead on familiarity with the physical structures and toponyms of the city.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> For the actual Greek inscription and a discussion Bartolomeo’s treatment, see Appendix I at the notes to chapter 7.

<sup>16</sup> The only exception is the identification of Tiberius as originally an inhabitant of Palaepolis, which presumes knowledge of Palaepolis as a different settlement from Naples. The temple inscription itself, of course, could be considered a “textual” source, but certainly not of the same kind as the other textual sources discussed here. Though one scholar has argued that the temple inscription had become a textual source—that is, had been translated from Greek to Latin by the noted physician and Greek translator Niccolò da Reggio, as the *Cronaca* itself claims—I find this wholly implausible: see the discussion in the notes to chapter 7 in Appendix I.

This brings us to the *Cronaca*'s last "pagan" topic, Virgil, to whom the latter half of chapter 16 (17B) and all of chapters 17 through 32 (18B–33B) are dedicated. Apart from some brief biographical information on the ancient poet, these chapters concern themselves with the magical spells Virgil wrought on Naples' behalf. Virgil's medieval reputation as a magician has been much studied, and the earliest legends' association of Virgilian magic with Naples led Domenico Comparetti to hypothesize that the tradition was born there, perhaps well before the first textual accounts of it appear in the later twelfth century. The earliest known Neapolitan accounts of these legends, however, are the *Cronaca di Partenope* and its source-text, "Commentary V," and their evident indebtedness to prior textual authorities suggests rather, as Giorgio Pasquale argued, that the legends were "imported" to Naples long after their creation.<sup>17</sup> Bartolomeo's sources are essentially two: "Commentary V," and Gervase of Tilbury's early-thirteenth-century *Otia imperialia*. While Bartolomeo depended heavily on these two works for his Virgilian legends, his treatment of them is quite autonomous. His sequence of legends does not follow that of "Commentary V" or Gervase, and the legends he borrows, sometimes combining elements of both, are often considerably altered and expanded with greater reference to the local environment.

Furthermore, Bartolomeo includes four legends found in neither of these two works, nor indeed in any other known textual antecedent. All can be considered variations on formulae familiar from earlier texts, and all relate to well-known local landmarks.<sup>18</sup> It is possible that these "new" legends, like the local embellishments the *Cronaca* adds to earlier authors' accounts, were Bartolomeo's own invention. The greater likelihood, however, is that Virgilian legends had been circulating for some time in Naples and had inspired the genesis of similar ones which could explain other curious local landmarks. That local or "oral" tradition in Naples had already adopted and transformed textual traditions on Virgil as a magician is suggested by the legend found in the *Cronaca* at chapter 26 (27B), which tells of four human skulls that inform the duke of Naples of events in the four corners of the world. This legend is found in no other textual source, but a similar one is recounted in Alexander

<sup>17</sup> Domenico Comparetti, *Virgilio nel medio evo* (Florence, 1896); Giorgio Pasquale, introduction to the 1941 Italian reprint of the same work. See also Jan Ziolkowski's introduction to the English translation, *Vergil in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1997), and John Webster Spargo, *Virgil the Mecromancer* (Cambridge, MA, 1934).

<sup>18</sup> These are the legends of the grasshopper (chapter 20 [21B]), the fish rock (24 [25B]), the Carbonara jousts (26 [27B]), and Monte Barbaro (31 [32B]): see Appendix I for details.

Neckam's *De naturis rerum* of circa 1200. Neckam's "Salvatio Romae" legend, as it is known, described statues atop a Roman palace, each representing a province of the Roman Empire and furnished with a bell. When a province rose in rebellion, the appropriate statue rang its bell, to warn the Romans and allow them to respond promptly to the threat.<sup>19</sup> The two versions are structurally very similar, that of the *Cronaca* having essentially transferred the action from Rome to Naples. We could attribute the local adaptation to Bartolomeo himself if there were reason to believe he had read Alexander's work, but the evidence strongly suggests he had not.<sup>20</sup> It seems most likely, therefore, that the "Salvatio Romae" legend had already become known in Naples and been adapted to fit a Neapolitan context, and that Bartolomeo drew on the local tradition rather than the original textual source for his rendition.

The evidence of the *Cronaca* therefore suggests that Pasquale was right about the ultimately textual origins of the Virgilian legends, but wrong in suggesting that only northern Europeans, for whom Naples was a distant and exotic location fitting to such wonders, could have invented them. The Virgilian legends were enthusiastically received in Naples: embellished with more local details when the original was already set in Naples, adapted to Naples when the original was set elsewhere, and multiplied through the invention of new legends that explained yet more local landmarks. The existence of such local traditions, which Bartolomeo occasionally refers to, helps to explain the autonomy he exhibited with regard to his textual sources.<sup>21</sup>

### *The Sacred Era*

Having concluded his account of Naples' pagan past with the Virgilian legends, Bartolomeo turned to its Christian history. Here too Bartolomeo relied very heavily on a compendium: in this case, the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio* or *SMP*. This work, mentioned briefly in the last chapter, was a text compiled between 1311 and 1317 for liturgical

<sup>19</sup> *Alexandri Neckam De naturis rerum*, ed. Thomas Wright (London, 1863), 310.

<sup>20</sup> In chapter 17 (18B), the *Cronaca* attributes the "fly legend" to Neckam, though that legend does not appear in Neckam's work. Doubtless Bartolomeo found Neckam's name cited in "Commentary V" and simply applied it to the wrong episode, the mistake easily understandable if he had not read Neckam directly, and unlikely if he had.

<sup>21</sup> In chapters 29 (30B), 30 (31B), and 32 (33B), Bartolomeo cites common opinion as his source on aspects of the Virgilian legends with the phrases *lo grosso populo tene, li antichi napolitani teneano*, and more generally, *credese et tenese*.

use by the cathedral clergy.<sup>22</sup> It recycled and embellished early-medieval material to narrate the origins of, benefactions to, and miracles associated with various churches in Naples, lending it a strong narrative character. These narrative parts of the work were published by Gennaro Maria Monti in 1936.<sup>23</sup> They account for nine chapters of the *Cronaca*: chapters 33–34 (34–35B), 36–37 (37–38B), and 40–44 (41–46B). Bartolomeo follows the *SMP* in the same sequence, copying all of its contents, and adding very few, easily identifiable embellishments of his own. Both the length of some of these chapters and the fidelity of Bartolomeo's borrowing make the *SMP* arguably the most significant textual source for this work.

Bartolomeo's translation of the *SMP* is interrupted at two points: chapter 35 (36B) and chapters 38–39 (39B–40B). The second interruption features the Cumaean sibyl's prophecy of Christ discussed above, which properly belongs to the "pagan" section of the narrative. The first interruption, however, is very much in keeping with the surrounding translation of the *SMP*, for it treats the career of Naples' first bishop Aspren, and is drawn from a source that also informed the *SMP*, namely the *Vita S. Aspren*.<sup>24</sup>

One final addition that the *Cronaca* made to the *SMP*, however, deserves special notice for its controversial and poorly understood nature. At the very end of its narration of the Donation of Constantine in chapter 40 (41B), the *Cronaca* adds that at the time of the Donation "a voice from heaven was heard which said, *hodie diffusum est venenum in ecclesie Dey*, that is, 'today poison has entered the Church of God.'" Gennaro Maria Monti, noting this addition, considered it a proof of the author's heretical, Spiritual Franciscan leanings.<sup>25</sup> Monti's suggestion was not unreasonable. The Spirituals, a group within the Franciscan order who believed in following a life of literal poverty in imitation of Christ and the apostles, criticized Church wealth and the Donation understood

---

<sup>22</sup> For the most recent dating of the work, see Serena Romano, "Introduzione: La cattedrale di Napoli, i vescovi, e l'immagine. Una storia di lunga durata," in *Il Duomo di Napoli dal paleocristiano all'età angioina*, ed. S. Romano and N. Bock (Naples, 2002), 16.

<sup>23</sup> G.M. Monti, "Il cosiddetto 'Chronicon,'" with edition at 137–144 and identification of its early-medieval sources on 131. The sixteenth-century copy of the work found in the archive of the Neapolitan cathedral is no longer available for consultation, such that only those sections edited by Monti can now be examined.

<sup>24</sup> This *Vita* was also the source for two comments Bartolomeo added to the previous chapter: see Appendix I at notes to chapter 34 (35B).

<sup>25</sup> Monti, "Il cosiddetto 'Chronicon,'" 135–136.

to have inaugurated it. Condemned by their fellow Franciscans for disobedience, by Dominicans who resented Franciscan claims of spiritual superiority on the basis of poverty, and eventually by the pope himself, the Spirituals nevertheless found support among some European leaders in the 1320s and 1330s, making the issue of Church wealth politically as well as theologically explosive in Bartolomeo's time. In this context, a condemnation of the Donation of Constantine as "poisoning" the Church smacks of Spiritual Franciscan views—views which, furthermore, scholars have long considered rife in early-fourteenth-century Naples.

As I have argued elsewhere, the characterization of the Angevin royal court and capital in this period as rife with Spiritual Franciscan heresy is greatly exaggerated.<sup>26</sup> Nor does Bartolomeo's interjection indicate a personal allegiance with Spiritual views. It would be odd if it did, since Bartolomeo elsewhere evinces such pleasure in noting the generosity of Constantine's benefactions to Neapolitan churches and their consequent wealth. In fact, the "poison legend," far from being a heretical Franciscan monopoly, was widespread among medieval writers. It was cited without criticism by a number of thirteenth-century clerical writers whose orthodoxy was not in doubt, including Odo of Cheriton, Hugh of St Cher, and Guillaume Perrault, and it continued to be cited by orthodox clerics like Remigio de' Girolami, O.P., and the Ranulf Higden, O.S.B., even in the fourteenth century, when the Church's attacks on pro-poverty views would presumably have made this critique of Church wealth especially sensitive.<sup>27</sup> There are no grounds, therefore, for assuming that Bartolomeo was expressing either his own unorthodox views or unorthodox sentiment current in his milieu.

---

<sup>26</sup> S. Kelly, "Robert of Naples (1309–1343) and the Spiritual Franciscans," *Cristianesimo nella storia* 20 (1999), 41–80.

<sup>27</sup> On the first three writers' citation of the legend, see Robert E. Lerner, "Poverty, Preaching, and Eschatology in the Revelation Commentaries of 'Hugh of St. Cher,'" in *The Bible in the Medieval World. Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. K. Walsh and D. Wood (Oxford, 1985), 173–174. Remigio cited it in his "Contra falsos professores": see E. Panella, ed., *Per lo studio di fra Remigio dei Girolami (d. 1319). Contra falsos Ecclesie professores* cc. 5–37 (Pistoia, 1979), at 136. Guillaume Perrault cited it in his *Summa de vitiis*, Book IV, "De avaricia." There is no modern edition of this work. The earliest printed edition is Venice, 1497; I consulted a microform of an undated, sixteenth-century edition printed by Berthold Ruppel in Basel. For Ranulf Higden, see his *Polychronicon*, ed. J. Lumby, 9 vols. (London, 1865–1886; repr. 1964). I thank Robert Lerner for pointing me to his own article on the subject and to clues on other authors' citations of the poison legend.



Given that the “poison legend” constituted, for Bartolomeo, a theologically neutral historical episode, we must still ask how he came across it. It was not in the *SMP* from which he drew the rest of chapter 40. Looking to the *SMP*’s own sources, however, we find that its account of Constantine and Pope Silvester ultimately derived from the *Liber pontificalis*, an extremely popular early-medieval collection of biographies of the Roman popes. In the Middle Ages, the *Liber*’s account of Silvester’s career was sometimes expanded by incorporating the *Gesta S. Silvestri* (also called the *Actus*, *Vita*, or *Legenda S. Silvestri*), a text of the later fifth or early sixth century that was itself extremely popular.<sup>28</sup> Two fourteenth-century authors who quote the poison legend, Ranulf Higden and John of Paris, both cite the *Gesta S. Silvestri* as their source for it.<sup>29</sup> The printed edition of the *Gesta* does not contain the poison story, but evidently medieval manuscript versions did. A mysteriously “heretical” passage thus emerges, on closer inspection, as a well-traveled interpolation to a standard religious text.

We know that Bartolomeo consulted the *Gesta S. Silvestri*, either as an independent work or in a copy of the *Liber pontificalis* that included it, for he borrowed passages from them immediately after his long translation of the *SMP*, in chapters 45–46 (47B–48B). These chapters provide more biographical and legendary material on Constantine’s and Silvester’s careers, and were doubtless included because of the important role these two figures played in the pious local legends already recounted in the *SMP*.

---

<sup>28</sup> The Latin text of the *Gesta S. Silvestri* was first edited by Boninus Mombritius in his fifteenth-century *Sanctuarium seu Vitae Sanctorum*, available in a two-volume modern edition (Paris, 1910). For a discussion of the text and its history, see Jan Willem Drijvers, *Helena Augusta. The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of her Finding of the True Cross* (Leiden, 1992), 36–37. A modern edition of the *Liber pontificalis* is that of Abbé L. Duchesne, *Le Liber pontificalis, texte, introduction, et commentaire*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1981).

<sup>29</sup> John of Paris, *De regia potestate et papali*, ed. and with a German translation by Fritz Bleinstein, published under the translated title *Über königliche und päpstliche Gewalt* (Stuttgart, 1969), 187: “Quod vero Deo displicuerit, ex hoc sumitur argumentum quia, ut legitur in Vita beati Silvestri pape, in donatione illa audita est vox angelorum in are dicentium, ‘Hodie in ecclesia venenum effusum est.’” Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon*, ed. cit., vol. 5, 130 (= *Polychronicon* lib. IV): “Proinde et hostis antiquus, facta per Constantinum ecclesiis hac publica largitione, legitus publice in aere pronunsiasse sic: ‘Hodie infusum est venenum in ecclesia Dei,’ unde Jeronimus scripsit in vitis patrum: ‘Ecclesia ex quo crevit possessionibus decrevit virtutibus ...’” At the end of this paragraph, which continues onto p. 132 in the facing-page edition, the source is given: “in legenda S. Silvestri.”

The legends of Constantinian foundations in Naples seem to have been even more numerous than those recorded in the *SMP*, for chapters 47 and 48 (49B–50B) record two more, found for the first time in the *Cronaca*. In the first of these, Constantine and his daughter Constance found S. Giovanni Maggiore, treated here as a double foundation dedicated equally to Saint Lucy, in thanks for surviving a sea storm. The second places Constantine's niece Patricia on the same storm-tossed ship, whose survival is repaid through the foundation of her eponymous monastery, S. Patrizia. Patricia was, in fact, a documented saint: a noble Byzantine virgin whose *Vita* had been composed between the ninth and twelfth centuries by a Neapolitan cleric. Bartolomeo draws on this *Vita* for the latter part of the chapter, awkwardly grafting it onto the legendary storm and imperial identity stated at the chapter's start; he also includes legends derived from the famous *inventio crucis* of Constantine's mother, Helena, which explain S. Patrizia's possession of relics from the True Cross.

Local hagiographical texts account for two more chapters. The tenth-century *Vita Athanasii* provides the information recounted in chapter 52 (54B), on bishop Athanasius' improvement of two local religious communities, while Naples' protection from Saracen attack through the intervention of patron saints Januarius and Agrippinus (chapter 53 [55B]) comes from the *Ex miraculis sancti Agrippini*, also of the tenth century.

Chapter 54 (56B), a short paragraph about another Saracen siege and the prayer to Saint Peter through which the Saracens drowned, may derive from the *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum*. Both place the siege in the reign of the Carolingian emperor Lothar (843–855) and note that the Saracen fleet drowned through divine intervention. If the *Gesta* was Bartolomeo's source, he omitted most of its details, including its references to the reigning eastern emperor and local Neapolitan leaders, and added the text of the prayer itself. His claim that the attack occurred in the reign of pope Gregory does suggest the *Gesta* as his source, however, for the preceding passage of the *Gesta* featured this pope.

Chapter 55 (57B) also recounts a saint's miracle in the context of war, but here the saint, Michael, is on the side of Naples' enemies. He protects the city of Sipanto, where Michael's famous early-medieval shrine was located, from Neapolitan attack, as recorded in the ninth-century *Liber de apparitione sancti Michaelis*. The *Cronaca* is not particularly close to this source's language, and probably drew on an intermediate text. The best candidate is, again, the *SMP*. Before the texts to be recited "in dedicatione ecclesie capitulum" (which Gennaro Maria Monti

published, and which the *Cronaca* faithfully translated) the *SMP* included one commemorating Saint Michael. Monti has given us only its title, but that title—“in apparitione sancti Michaeli arcangeli capitulum”—suggests that the *SMP* text here was a version of the *Liber de apparitione*.<sup>30</sup> The inclusion of Michael in the city’s liturgical memory probably relates to the existence of a church in his honor in Naples’ city center, around which, as the *Cronaca* attests, a neighborhood association or *seggio* of the same name formed.<sup>31</sup>

While its origins may have been liturgically colored, the Michael legend functions narratively in the *Cronaca* principally as an instance of Naples’ early-medieval wars, and we can conclude this survey of the *Cronaca*’s early-medieval narration by returning to three earlier chapters that focus similarly on this aspect of Neapolitan history. Chapters 50 (52B) and 51 (53B) treat a Saracen attack of the late eighth century. An account of such a seige appears in the late-fourteenth-century Vatican manuscript Vat. Ottob. 2940.<sup>32</sup> Because this manuscript was copied at the end of the fourteenth century and contains another work, the *Cronicon Siculum*, that borrows material from the *Cronaca di Partenope*, it is possible that its account of the Saracen seige is a Latin translation of Bartolomeo’s version, rather than a copy of Bartolomeo’s source.<sup>33</sup> If that is the case, we can know nothing of the source-text for this episode in the *Cronaca*. It is equally possible, however, that Vat. Ottob. 2940 included both a text borrowing from the *Cronaca* and one of the *Cronaca*’s sources because these were the materials available in Naples regarding local history. In what follows I will assume that the Vatican copy does preserve an earlier text that served as Bartolomeo’s source, since it is at least possible and we have no other text with which to compare our work. The reader should keep in mind, however, that their differences may result from the Vatican copy’s alteration of the *Cronaca* and not vice versa.

---

<sup>30</sup> See G.M. Monti, “Il cosiddetto ‘Chronicon,’” 137. Monti is now our only available text for the *SMP*: see above at note 23.

<sup>31</sup> Bartolomeo Capasso, *Topografia della città di Napoli nel secolo XI* (Naples, 1895; repr. 1984), 98–102, notes that ducal Naples had several churches dedicated to S. Michael, not all of which survived. The *Cronaca di Partenope* refers only to one, which gave its name to a *seggio* in the city center: see chapter 14 of the following edition.

<sup>32</sup> This unique copy, done in the late fourteenth century, was the basis for the edition of Georg Waitz entitled *Neapolitanorum victoria ficta* and published in *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et italicarum saec. VI–IX* (Hannover, 1878), 465–466.

<sup>33</sup> On the *Cronicon Siculum* and its dating, see below in Chapter Five at nn. 14–20.

Compared with the Vatican copy, Bartolomeo's version is a quite faithful translation, approaching the degree of fidelity that he demonstrated toward the *SMP*. He added to it, however, in a few notable ways. He placed more emphasis on the "French" (*francischi*, here meaning the Carolingians) who helped to defend Naples, perhaps in deference to the French origins of the Angevins who ruled Naples in Bartolomeo's time. He also expanded the list of foreigners who repopulated Naples after it was decimated in this battle, and who thereby "contaminated" Neapolitan blood. Curiously, Bartolomeo identified some of these new immigrants as African, though he (unlike the Vatican text) also identifies Africa as a homeland of the attacking Saracens. Presumably to establish the orthodox character of these African immigrants, Bartolomeo added a passage on the African origins of Augustine, two of his companions, and Gaudio-sus, a Neapolitan patron saint. Finally, Bartolomeo placed more emphasis on the battle's link to an existing Neapolitan church. The Vatican text mentioned briefly that since the victory occurred on Saint Paul's feast day, a church was built in Paul's honor. Bartolomeo elaborated on this notice in chapter 51, recalling the fact (mentioned in an earlier chapter) that the church of S. Paolo Maggiore was erected on the site of Naples' first pagan temple, specifying that the church was built by "Anthino consul and duke of the Neapolitans," and adding that Anthino moved the course of a stream that the Saracens had used to sail so close to the city. Anthino's construction of San Paolo Maggiore is also mentioned in the *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum*, which, as we have seen, was probably Bartolomeo's source for the other Saracen episode in chapter 54 (56B).

Immediately preceding the two chapters devoted to the Saracen siege and the resulting foundation of S. Paolo is a similar "war story," set in the sixth century (chapter 49 [51B]). I discuss it after the Saracen account to better illustrate its indebtedness to that source. Here the *Cronaca* recounts the conquest of Naples by the Goths and the reconquest of the city by Belisarius, general of Emperor Justinian. Previous scholars passed over this chapter in their list of the *Cronaca*'s sources, but its narrative so closely echoes Procopius' *History of the Wars* that a translation of Procopius must have been his source.<sup>34</sup> As in the account of Naples'

---

<sup>34</sup> Bartolomeo clearly did not know Greek, given his poor translation of the Greek inscription on the temple façade in chapter 6, and must therefore have used a translation, presumably into Latin. How widespread such translations were in the Middle Ages is unclear. A 1962 edition of Procopius notes no translations earlier than that of Leonardo Bruni in 1441: see Jacobus Haury, ed., *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia* (Leipzig, 1962), vol. 1, pp. liv–lv. Since Greek was spoken in parts of southern Italy into the fourteenth

attack on Sipanto, Bartolomeo was faithful to his source even when it describes Neapolitan failures: here, their “laziness” in accepting Gothic conquest without a fight. In this case, however, Bartolomeo seems to have had a particular use for the criticism. In Procopius’ account, Belisarius’s soldiers certainly killed a number of Neapolitans in the battle (and the *Cronaca* translates this particular passage fairly closely), but Belisarius ultimately spared the vanquished, and “released to the Neapolitans their women and children and slaves, one and all, no insult having been experienced by them.” In the *Cronaca*, by contrast, “Naples was completely destroyed and desolated, and then was inhabited by men from elsewhere, from nearby cities and castles, that is from Capua, Sorrento, Amalfi and Atella, and from that time Neapolitan blood was contaminated.” This altered outcome was obviously inspired by the “contamination” story Bartolomeo encountered in the account of the eighth-century Saracen seige. Not only are the “foreigners” identical to those in the Saracen seige account (Capuans, etc.), but the same depopulation and contamination are said to have occurred. Thus Bartolomeo magnified the traumatic effect of foreign immigration to Naples. And since the Procopius tale comes first in chronological order, Bartolomeo’s final addition to the subsequent Saracen seige account was to note that Neapolitan blood was then contaminated “for the second time.”

### *The “Royal” Era*

The third and last section of the *Cronaca* narrates Neapolitan history in the “royal era,” that is, from the arrival of the Normans in the late eleventh century up to Bartolomeo’s own time. Chapter 56 (58B) constitutes a sort of Norman pre-history, listing the lords of southern Italy’s various regions “before it was united and made one and called a realm.” Three more chapters tell of the exploits of Robert Guiscard, such that the actual unification of the kingdom under Roger II occurs in chapter 60 (62B). Thenceforth the narration follows the sequence of Norman, Staufeu, and Angevin kings of the realm. Our discussion of Bartolomeo’s textual sources for this section can be brief, for only one has been identified: the late-twelfth-century chronicle attributed to Romuald of Salerno. A few

---

century and was utilized in Naples, too, by some clergy, it is not implausible that Latin translation of the *History of the Wars* (or a translation of this episode, incorporated into another work) was available by circa 1350 in Naples.

of the details featured in the *Cronaca* chapters 57 (59B) and 58 (60B) can be found in Romuald; following chapters (59A to near the end of chapter 63A) represent a summary of Romuald's more detailed account, in which Bartolomeo occasionally translates his source very closely.<sup>35</sup>

Since Romuald's chronicle ends in 1178, Bartolomeo must have consulted other sources for his account of the end of Norman rule and of the Staufens and Angevins, but my searches, like those of previous scholars, have yielded no definitive candidates. The events and facts Bartolomeo recounted were well known and his version, for the most part, was quite brief. The most likely explanations are that he consulted an unknown summation of various historians, or that he himself altered and abbreviated known accounts to the point that the *Cronaca's* relation to them is no longer recognizable. In either case his interest in this period seems rather limited: only twenty percent of the *Cronaca* covers these centuries, compared to eighty percent devoted to Naples' pre-royal past.

One feature of the *Cronaca's* narration in this section merits special mention. In chapters 69A, 73A, and 75A, Bartolomeo listed the various men invested with southern-Italian counties by the first three Angevin kings. The lists are short for Charles I and Charles II (four and six respectively), but quite long, comprising twenty men, for King Robert. Since Bartolomeo was himself an official in the royal treasury, he would have had access to documents listing such enfeoffments, and it seems likely that these lists represent his personal addition to the narration.

### Conclusion

Bartolomeo's use of sources illustrates a few features of his intellectual horizons, compositional methods, and interests. He was clearly able to read Latin, the language of all his textual sources, and could translate them with a rather high degree of fidelity when he chose. He was apparently most familiar with local hagiographical and liturgical sources, which constitute the core of the middle section of his work. Though quite interested in pagan antiquity, he was not very familiar with classical texts. He relied principally on a recent Latin compendium ("Commentary V"), and consulted directly only a few classical works that were well known in

---

<sup>35</sup> Starting in the second paragraph of chapter 60 (62B), the Group B text offers a different version of events, also ultimately drawn from Romuald but through the mediation of the "Southernized Villani." For more detailed discussion see Chapter Six and Appendix I below.

the Middle Ages. Moreover, he was happy to intersperse these ancient authorities with medieval ones, including Eustazio da Matera and Gervase of Tilbury. Regarding more contemporary history, he relied on the chronicle attributed to Romuald and probably on other histories, supplemented, in all likelihood, by his own familiarity with the events of the Angevin age and by his access to treasury documents for his lists of recently ennobled counts.

In terms of his authentication of his own narrative through explicit citation of previous authors, Bartolomeo showed no particular preference for ancient over “modern” writers. He did, however, cite authorities much more often in his narration of pagan antiquity than in his narration of early Christian or medieval events. Though he drew on a rather large number of medieval Christian works, for instance, he cited only one—the *Life* of Athanasius—and then only because his source-text had cited it.<sup>36</sup> And of course he cited by name neither Romuald nor whatever other contemporary chroniclers he relied upon for his narration of Naples’ royal era. This pattern of citation again suggests his lesser familiarity with pagan antiquity, which consequently required more invocation of textual authorities, and perhaps his expectation in his readers of lesser familiarity with this era, whereas the lives of local saints and local medieval events he could assume were already well known to his audience.

Third, close comparison of his text with his sources suggests that he exercised a considerable degree of authorial autonomy. He reconfigured Livy to portray Naples in a more positive light, both in a chronological reordering of events and in the details of his account of Naples’ ancient wars with Rome. He offered an original translation of Virgil to portray Naples as a center of learning and very noble, and reinterpreted Seneca again to emphasize Naples’ intellectual excellence. Given his ability, demonstrated in other passages, to translate very literally, these lapses cannot easily be attributed to his poor understanding of Latin. They seem rather to represent his own authorial choice. In the same way, he consulted Procopius—not a local or widely familiar text—and altered the ending of the cited passage for his own purposes, in this case to emphasize the disastrous consequences of immigration. While “Commentary V” and Gervase of Tilbury provided him with many Virgilian

---

<sup>36</sup> The *Vita* of Athanasius is cited in chapter 43 (44B), as part of an integral translation of the *SMP*. When Bartolomeo directly consulted this *Vita* for chapter 52 (54B), he did not cite his source.

legends, he followed neither slavishly, placing them in his own chosen order, altering details of their accounts, and adding further embellishments.

This autonomy is even more evident in Bartolomeo's inclusion of episodes with no known textual source. The legends of Naples' first founder and of its three later settlers, of Patrizia as Constantine's niece, and of Virgilian benefactions found in no other text, indicate that Bartolomeo felt free to round out his account of Naples' past with stories derived, most likely, from local tradition. It is of course possible that those legends had been written down before Bartolomeo composed his work, and the manuscripts simply have not survived. Even admitting that possibility—which can be neither proven nor disproven—it is clear that Bartolomeo was perfectly willing to consider oral testimony an authoritative source, for he cited it on several occasions.<sup>37</sup>

A final sign of Bartolomeo's authorial independence is his relationship to the *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum*. Though the *Gesta*, as far as we know, was the only preexisting source focused on Bartolomeo's own chosen subject—the history of the city of Naples—Bartolomeo seems to have drawn only two things from it: Anthino's construction of San Paolo Maggiore in chapter 51 (53B), and the drowning of Saracen ships in a ninth-century attack in chapter 54 (56B).<sup>38</sup> That Bartolomeo had access to the work is all but certain: it was a cathedral text *par excellence*, and we know that Bartolomeo consulted other texts in the cathedral's collection, such as the *SMP*. That Bartolomeo read it seems very likely, given the two correspondences between it and the *Cronaca* named above. It may be telling, with regard to their connection, that though the *Gesta* survives only in a single manuscript copy, we now know of a second, incomplete copy, in one of the earliest manuscripts also containing the *Cronaca di Partenope*.<sup>39</sup> If we assume, as I think we must, that Bartolomeo knew the *Gesta episcoporum*, it is striking how little he borrowed from it, dispensing with its chronological sequence and ignoring virtually all its

---

<sup>37</sup> In addition to the three instances cited in note 21 above, see Bartolomeo's citation of "uno altro opinione" in chapter 51 (53B).

<sup>38</sup> The *Cronaca* echoes the *Gesta* on two other points—Pope Silvester's directive on clerical vestments and Athanasius' appointment of an abbot to S. Gennaro fuori le mura—but certainly cited them from other texts (the *Liber pontificalis* and *Vita Athanasii*, respectively), as we know from his longer surrounding citation of the latter works.

<sup>39</sup> The only complete copy is that edited by Georg Waitz, Vat. Lat. 5007. As noted in Chapter Six below, manuscript M1 preserves a partial copy, which was unknown to previous students of the *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum* as it was to previous students of the *Cronaca di Partenope*.



rich account of the major political figures and events of the earlier Middle Ages. Naples' Christian past, at least before the advent of the monarchy, was for Bartolomeo not a matter of political leaders, but of a communal identity expressed through patron saints, local wars, and the physical monuments that recalled both, and Bartolomeo kept his distance from the *Gesta* in order to tell that different story.

For a layman, writing in an idiom only very recently considered worthy of literary texts, and attempting a chronologically complete history of Naples such as had never before been undertaken in any language, Bartolomeo's approach to his sources displays a notable degree of confidence in his own authority. Indeed, it is striking that in his introduction he offers no justification for his historiographical project or his decision to write in the vernacular—justifications that, however rhetorical, were fairly common among later-medieval historians. He was not the most educated man of his time and place, nor does his work evince the thematic consistency or rhetorical polish one finds in a contemporary lay historian like Giovanni Villani.

From a scholarly perspective, Bartolomeo's averageness may enhance rather than diminish the interest of his work. As David d'Avray has suggested of the authors of model sermons, precisely in *not* being one of the great original minds of his time, Bartolomeo may offer us a better window onto the shared culture of a broad middle spectrum of his society, and onto the methods and mindset of those "articulate classes" who reflected and shaped contemporaries' views as much as their more famous and accomplished counterparts did.<sup>40</sup> His text calls for sustained comparison with other vernacular histories, in Italy and elsewhere, to evaluate its idiosyncrasies and potential commonalities with regard to such historical writing. In the meantime we can look more closely into just how the *Cronaca* shaped others' views by tracing, in the next chapter, its influence in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

---

<sup>40</sup> David d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars. Manuscript Sermons Diffused around Paris Before 1300* (Oxford, 1985), 257–259.

## chapter five

### DIFFUSION AND INFLUENCE, 1350–1490

The influence exerted by the *Cronaca di Partenope* in the centuries following its composition has been acknowledged by the principal scholars who have studied the work. The most thorough treatment was that of Gennaro Maria Monti, who called attention to the number of extant manuscript copies, the three early printed editions, and the continuation represented by the “Later Angevin Chronicle” (which Monti treated as a part of the *Cronaca*, in keeping with then-current scholarly tradition). Building upon research conducted by Bartolomeo Capasso, he also identified later works that borrowed from or incorporated significant segments of the *Cronaca di Partenope*. Some of these never made their way into print in the early modern era, including the *Cronicon Siculum* of the late fourteenth century, the *Cronica di Napoli* of Notar Giacomo (circa 1500), a sixteenth-century Latin translation by Alvaro de Paternò, and two sixteenth-century works, the “Croniche de li Rì Antiqui” of Gaspare Fuscolillo and a historical miscellany known as the “Cuomo zibaldone.” Monti also noted three printed works of the sixteenth century indebted to the *Cronaca di Partenope*—those of Pandolfo Collenuccio, Lucio Scoppa, and Luigi Contarini—and citations of our work by Giovanni Antonio Summonte at the turn of the seventeenth.<sup>1</sup> This list is a valuable starting point for any student interested in the transmission and legacy of the *Cronaca di Partenope*. Occupying only a single paragraph, however, it remains little more than a starting point, and given the imperfect state of knowledge on the *Cronaca* in Monti’s time, requires correction in some respects as well.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> G.M. Monti, “La ‘Cronaca di Partenope’ (Premessa all’edizione critica),” in idem, *Dai normanni agli aragonesi* (Trani, 1936), 59. Monti identifies the pages of Summonte specifically referencing the *Cronaca di Partenope* at the start of this article (p. 32), where he also names some other “modern” scholars of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries who referred to our text.

<sup>2</sup> The treatment of the “Later Angevin Chronicle” as part of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, for instance, should no longer be followed, as discussed at the start of Chapter Two above, and the “Southernized Villani” (in Monti’s terminology, Part IIIa of the *Cronaca di Partenope*) deserves to be considered something more than a “reworking of Giovanni Villani.” Monti dates the *Cronicon Siculum* to the fifteenth century, though it ends in 1396

To trace in detail all the permutations of and borrowings from the *Cronaca di Partenope* through the seventeenth century is beyond the scope of the present chapter. The different cultural and historical circumstances of those later writers, the adaptations they made to the *Cronaca*, and the ways those adaptations reflect contemporary values and interests would ideally be taken into consideration, and involve a more historical-analytical approach to the work's reception than is appropriate here.

The years between the *Cronaca's* composition and the appearance of the first printed edition are a different matter. The evidence for the *Cronaca's* diffusion and influence in this period is little known and (to the extent it has been discussed at all) poorly understood, and derives largely from the manuscript information offered in Chapter Six below. Adumbrating that evidence in more detail here therefore seems to me a necessary counterpart to the brief comments offered with regard to the extant manuscripts. It aids in correcting some of the mischaracterizations of the contents of various manuscripts offered by previous scholars; it lends further support to my contention that the original *Cronaca* included what scholarship previously considered two separate works; and it describes in greater detail the separate compositions previously included under the title "Cronaca di Partenope." More important, it offers evidence of the florescence of a tradition of local historical or historical-descriptive literature in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, a period often considered a cultural nadir in Campania before the "renaissance" inaugurated by the Aragonese conquest of the realm.<sup>3</sup> After the appearance of the first printed edition of the *Cronaca di Partenope* between 1486 and 1490, the work's reception was conditioned by the particular interventions made by the editor and by the existence of the print medium itself.

---

and was probably finished in that year, and his claim that this and other works were copies of "Part II" of the *Cronaca* (i.e. chapters 56 ff.) is inaccurate, as will be discussed below. His list of printed works indebted to the *Cronaca* should also be expanded, not all of which relied on printed editions of the *Cronaca* as their source. I hope to treat the post-1486 reception and adaptation of the *Cronaca* in more depth in a separate study.

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, the introductory and concluding comments by Francesco Sabatini in *Napoli angioina. Cultura e società* (Naples, 1975), 10, 213. While acknowledging that historiography might represent an exception to Campania's cultural poverty in the later fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, he also concludes that it was so sparse and unimportant as to constitute no significant exception. Given the state of knowledge about later-Angevin historiography in 1974, that Sabatini acknowledged it at all seems quite perceptive. As I hope the following discussion will demonstrate, closer inspection of the evidence, largely drawn from manuscripts containing the *Cronaca*, bears out Sabatini's suspicion regarding this exception, and invites one to rethink the larger conclusions regarding late-Angevin culture and its disjuncture from that of the Aragonese age.

Without denying the important continuities between the manuscript and print eras, the publication of the *editio princeps* seems a plausible ending point to the present discussion.

The later fourteenth century has left us at most one surviving manuscript copy of the *Cronaca* (PL), but other indices demonstrate an influence far outstripping this survival rate. The first of those indices is the “Southernized Villani,” a work that borrowed from the *Cronaca* for its own narration of southern Italian history, and that circulated with the *Cronaca* in most manuscript copies.<sup>4</sup> This work, comprising 168 chapters, was principally an extensive excerpt of Giovanni Villani’s Florentine-centered *Nuova Cronica*. Starting with Villani’s Book III, chapter 8, it proceeds, following Villani’s order of chapters, to Book X, chapter 296, culling from that huge expanse of text only those chapters or parts of chapters its author found most pertinent to southern Italy. Though its borrowings are often quite faithful, they were not mindless. The “SV” author omitted the opening or closing lines of chapters that segued from or into specifically Florentine material, as well as “superfluous” information within a given chapter (for instance, the comments on events in the *oltremare* in Villani III: 11, the rest of which was copied as “SV” chapter 3). It also brought together material found in separate Villani chapters when this better suited its narrative continuity. Chapter 16, for instance, is largely a copy of Villani VI: 17, discussing the battles between Emperor Henry VI and Tancred for control of Sicily. Villani here referred back to an earlier chapter (V: 20, ll. 75–87) where he had discussed the sisters of Tancred imprisoned by Henry VI. The “SV” author instead copied the relevant lines from that earlier Villani chapter here, to create a more condensed and thorough narrative of his subject.

More notable for present purposes are the “SV” author’s additions to Villani’s narrative, which reflect his central interest in southern Italian history and particularly in the advent of its Angevin rulers. The “SV”

---

<sup>4</sup> The description that follows is based on my study of the copy of the “SV” in M<sub>1</sub>, which I have compared to Villani’s text for the incipit and explicit of each chapter and in many cases for the whole text of the chapter. I have also checked the copy of the “SV” in M<sub>1</sub> against that in P<sub>1</sub> for the number and sequence of chapters, with spot collation of incipits and explicits, which suggests that the text in M<sub>1</sub> is representative. A similar comparison with GC reveals that the chapters of the “Southernized Villani” were here copied out of order and mixed with the following text, the “Universal Villani Excerpt.” Comparison of the “Southernized Villani” with the interpolated material in Group B manuscripts of the *Cronaca* will be discussed below.

opens with Villani III: 8 on the advent of Islam, for “although it is outside our principal subject, the facts of the city of Naples,” yet Islam “wrought great changes in the world.” At the end of the chapter it adds, “now let us return to our material, since in the realm of Sicily German rule has ended. The French reigned, so we will briefly tell of their origin.” The “SV” then picks up with Villani III: 10 on the Carolingians. Having narrated this Carolingian origin of the French rulers of southern Italy in five chapters, the “SV” closes by stating that Pippin’s lineage ruled for 236 years (corresponding to Villani III: 14, eleven lines from the end). It then begins a new chapter that again links the Carolingians to the kings of Sicily (“to narrate the progeny of the kings of the realm of Sicily, who were descended from the royal family of France ...”) before skipping to Villani V: 4 on the advent of the Capetian dynasty, which it concludes by repeating that the Germans were replaced in southern Italy by a dynasty descended from the French royal house.

Interjections in following chapters suggest the author’s hostility to those German rulers. In chapter 16 the “SV” interrupts Villani’s narration to add, “it should be known, before we go further, that Tancred, bastard of the Guiscard, with the conscious choice of the realm, ruled the kingdom illicitly [*contro lo debito*] for five years, because the lords and citizens had great hatred for German rule. Therefore the emperor Henry could never acquire the kingdom during Tancred’s lifetime.” Again in chapter 17, it adds to the narration of Villani VI: 18 the comment, “and many [southern Italians] Henry sent to prison in Germany with their wives and children, and he began to rule tyrannically.” And in chapter 19 it adds, with respect to the Church’s governance of southern Italy during Frederick II’s minority, “the kingdom was never better than at this time when the Church governed it.” Indeed, the bulk of the “Southernized Villani” focuses on the overthrow of Staufan rule and the conquest of the kingdom by Charles I of Anjou: this is the central historical drama its author wished to record.

In doing so, the “SV” author records details and events lacking from Villani’s narration that illustrate his knowledge of local affairs. Often they are small additions: the length of Henry VI’s rule not only in the empire but in “Apulia” and the precise age of Frederick II at his father’s death (chapter 17), or the name of the Sicilian monastery where Constance lived as a nun before being married to Henry VI (chapter 18). When it came to Naples, however, the “SV” additions are more extensive. Noting, like the *Cronaca di Partenope*, that Naples was first joined to the Sicilian realm at the time of Roger II’s coronation, the “SV” adds a further

anecdote describing Roger II's sojourn in Naples, where he ennobled 150 knights and was received by the citizens with great joy and celebration. To the account of Conrad Staufens's siege of Naples (chapter 34), he adds that Naples' walls were the most beautiful in the world, and explains that Conrad succeeded in conquering it with the aid of a spy within the city, who shot an arrow to which was attached a message (reproduced here in Latin) specifying how Conrad should proceed in order to capture the city. These episodes, as well as a comment in chapter 35 specifying pope Clement IV's date of death and burial in Naples, strongly suggest that the "SV" author was a Neapolitan, and that the affairs of this city were of particular concern to him.

These brief observations may suffice to illustrate a few points. The "SV" author had access to Villani's *Nuova Cronica*, not surprisingly given the intensive contacts between Florence and Naples throughout the fourteenth century. He perceived it, rightly, as a rich source for the history of southern Italy, and took care to tailor its contents in order to focus more exclusively on the region, adding additional commentary to underscore this orientation and to fill out the local details of major events. Thus in his historiographical project and his likely Neapolitan origin, the "SV" author was quite similar to Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa.

Indeed, Bartolomeo's work was another of his source texts. The "SV" author borrowed from it for his narration of the Norman kings in chapters 9–11, here too adding his own Neapolitan details (for instance, the Normans' building of the castle known as the "Normandia"). He borrowed from it again regarding details of the first three Angevin kings, such as the full list of Charles II's male and female children (chapter 90, where Villani VIII: 95 mentions only some of the sons), and the long description of Charles II's notable deeds, including his building projects in Naples and the counts he ennobled (chapter 121).

The "Southernized Villani" is therefore the first example of the *Cronaca's* influence as a source for another local history. Further, the two regularly circulated together. Though our earliest manuscript witness of this joint circulation (P1) dates from circa 1400, it must have begun several decades earlier: in time for a copyist of the *Cronaca*—the progenitor of the redacted, "Group B" version—to note the much-expanded account of thirteenth-century southern Italian affairs found in the "SV" and add some of that account into his redaction of the *Cronaca* itself.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> For further discussion of the relationship between the "Southernized Villani" and the redacted version of the *Cronaca*, see the following chapter.

Some of the chapters borrowed by the Group B progenitor were themselves straight copies of Villani's text: these are the only borrowings hitherto noted by scholars, and resulted in the erroneous supposition that Villani's work was the Group B progenitor's direct source. In other cases the Group B progenitor borrowed the original material of the "SV" author. The description of Roger II's visit to Naples is one of the "SV" passages that made its way back into the expanded *Cronaca*. Indeed, the bulk of the account of the Norman kings, as given in the Group B manuscripts, comes from the "SV." Since the "SV" itself had borrowed some of this material from the original version of the *Cronaca*, their accounts are similar, but small changes, such as the attribution to the Normans of the Normandia castle, indicate that the "SV" was the Group B manuscripts' source. Again, the account in the "SV" of Conradin's campaign to recapture southern Italy (chapters 53, 56–57) was copied, and in places much condensed, for reinsertion into the redacted *Cronaca*; the death and burial of Innocent IV in Naples, some details regarding the Sicilian Vespers, the description of Charles II, and other facts similarly made their way from the "SV" into this revised version of the *Cronaca*.

The "Group B" version of the *Cronaca* is thus a quite hybrid text: partly Bartolomeo's narrative, partly that of Giovanni Villani as filtered through the "SV" author, and partly the "SV" author's original contributions about Neapolitan history. Our earliest manuscript copy of the Group B version is PL, usually dated to 1380–1400 but probably closer to 1400. Since PL bears signs of further, unique alterations to the text, it was certainly not the original "B" version. The PL copyist might have consulted the original "B" text and been responsible for the unique characteristics of his manuscript; he might well have been one or two steps further removed from it. The composition of the "SV," therefore, must have occurred quite soon after Bartolomeo finished his own work circa 1350, and it must have circulated with the *Cronaca* almost immediately, in time for the Group B progenitor to conflate them and for the PL copyist to obtain either the Group B original or a later copy of it. Thus, though PL is our only (possible) fourteenth-century manuscript of the *Cronaca* to survive, its history alone indicates the existence of several earlier manuscript copies (including that used by the "SV" author), and a degree of interest that resulted in the transmutations of the *Cronaca* through the "SV" and back into the much-altered Group B version of the *Cronaca* itself.

The Group B version's borrowings from the "Southernized Villani" are sometimes very much in the spirit of the original *Cronaca di Partenope*. In some cases they show greater attention to the particular affairs of

Naples than Bartolomeo's text. The account of Roger II is a good example. Here his legitimation and coronation are linked closely with his warm reception in Naples, suggesting, more strongly than the Group A version, Naples' choice in submitting to him, and linking his happy elevation to that of Naples itself, which gains prestige from the visit of king and pope. Bartolomeo's interest in the fortunes and dignity of the urban patriciate is also underlined in this passage, which features Roger's gifts to over a hundred Neapolitan knights. Again in the list of counts enfeoffed by King Robert, the Group B version (here too following the "SV") adds the Siginulfo brothers to the list.<sup>6</sup> As the only native Neapolitans thus ennobled during the early fourteenth century, they provided exactly the sort of example of patrician exaltation we might expect Bartolomeo to have trumpeted.

Similarly, the topographical interest evident in the original *Cronaca*, especially in its early chapters, is more intensively carried through to the work's later chapters on southern Italian kings in the Group B version. In this case, however, the Group B text's intensification of a quality already apparent in the original *Cronaca* ultimately points to noteworthy difference between the two versions—specifically, their attitude toward Angevin-era interventions in the physical city. Castel Nuovo, new center of political life for the city and the realm, is mentioned multiple times in the Group B text, and the beauty of its chapel (doubtless the one frescoed, at King Robert's request, by Giotto) is here said to surpass that of any place on earth. The foundation of numerous mendicant churches, and the promotion of the cult of Saint Louis of Anjou, also merit mention in this version.<sup>7</sup> The original *Cronaca* was more reticent on the mendicant churches founded or lavishly expanded by the Angevins and was totally silent on the cult of St. Louis of Anjou, and as a result appears to favor Naples' older, "indigenous" cults and cult centers. In the Group B version, by contrast, Angevin contributions are fully incorporated into the sacred identity of the city. This more positive assessment of Angevin innovations in civic life is evident as well in the Group B version's description of Santa Restituta as a chapel in chapter 43 (44B). Originally a separate basilica, it had already been incorporated into the enlarged and reoriented cathedral by Bartolomeo's time, but he had continued to refer to it as a "church" in its own right—another instance of his conservative vision of Naples' physical fabric. The Group B text's acknowledgment of the transformed

---

<sup>6</sup> On these brothers see above in Chapter Three at nn. 26–27.

<sup>7</sup> See the numerous examples in chapters 90B–94B.



cathedral, and with it the diminished status of Santa Restituta, bespeaks a later moment when those alterations were apparently less emotionally charged.

Finally, Group B's addition of three chapters on emperor Frederick I, derived from Villani through the mediation of the "SV," broadens the text's scope. Just as the original *Cronaca* expanded its geographical purview at the moment southern Italy became a single kingdom to include in its frame the whole realm, so the Group B version expands its geographical scope yet further, and in a more northerly direction, embracing events of northern Italy and the Holy Roman Empire as now relevant to and implicated in Neapolitan affairs.

In addition to its borrowings from the "Southernized Villani," the Group B version of the *Cronaca* features changes of its own which are not insignificant to the history of the work's reception and transformation through time. The first change is subtle, and regards the description of the Staufen rulers. The original *Cronaca* remains fairly neutral on Staufen succession, noting only that Tancred resisted Henry VI's claim "with the consent and will of the realm's counts and barons." The "Southernized Villani," as mentioned above, is more outspokenly anti-Staufen. In addition to remarking on southern Italian hatred for the Germans, it criticizes the marriage of the heiress Constance to Henry VI, declaring that their child Frederick II's persecution of the Church was only to be expected, since he was born of a nun (contravening Constance's sacred vows) and "against nature," Constance being reputedly beyond childbearing age. The Group B version, however, diverges from its "SV" exemplar in stressing instead the propriety of Constance's and Henry VI's succession, writing that Henry "justly succeeded Lady Constance, legitimate heiress of the Guiscard lords," and saying nothing, in the passage on Frederick II's birth, to malign either him or his mother. It also adds that after Tancred's death, Constance and Henry "came and peacefully took the realm." Thereafter, the Group B text conforms to both the original *Cronaca* and the "SV" in acknowledging that the Staufen began to behave tyrannically. Its interest, therefore, seems not to be in rehabilitating the reputation of the Staufen, but rather in affirming the legitimacy of their succession. The stronger pro-Angevin, anti-Staufen partisanship of Bartolomeo (even more pronounced in the "Southernized Villani") here softens into a more universally pro-royal outlook.

This outlook may also explain the last addition found in the Group B version: its inclusion of a final chapter narrating Joanna I's first marriage to Andrew of Hungary, Andrew's assassination, and the avenging

invasion of his brother Louis, King of Hungary. Andrew's assassination was hardly something of which Louis of Taranto, Joanna's second husband, would wish to be reminded, since he himself had been suspected of involvement in the murder as part of his attempt to replace Andrew as Joanna's husband and king. Bartolomeo, who dedicated the *Cronaca* to Louis of Taranto, had thus discreetly overlooked Andrew's very existence in order to present Louis as a king with no sordid history behind his claim. But to many in Naples in those years and after, Andrew had been the rightful king of the realm, and a copyist like the Group B progenitor, with strong views about legitimate succession (and further removed than Bartolomeo from the tense years following Andrew's death), could not pass over the murder in silence.<sup>8</sup>

If the "Southernized Villani" and the Group B version of the *Cronaca* illustrate the considerable interest in and desire to extend Bartolomeo's account in the later fourteenth century, a third work of the period represents an original continuation of it. This is the work I refer to as the "Later Angevin Chronicle." It narrates in fifty-four chapters the history of Naples' Angevin rulers from 1325 to 1382, and was probably written over several decades. For instance, it refers to Charles of Durazzo as "now king of Jerusalem and Sicily," titles he held from 1382 until his death in 1386. A reference in a later chapter to the "duke of Milan," however, suggests the author composed this chapter in or after 1395, when the Visconti first acquired the ducal title.<sup>9</sup> Its author must have been Neapolitan, for he has detailed knowledge of events in the city and shows special interest in the building projects and urban improvements undertaken there; indeed, he has long been considered a reliable source on the dynastic and local history of these decades.<sup>10</sup> The mystery of this work regards the circumstances of its composition. No manuscript copies of it survive from the fourteenth or even fifteenth century. It first appears in the 1486–1490 edition of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, where it is treated graphically as an integral part of the *Cronaca*, and the only known manuscript copy of it

---

<sup>8</sup> Though manuscript E lacks this final chapter, its presence in PL (where the condition of the manuscript leaves it mutilated) and in the first edition suggest that it was integral to the Group B version and not a unique addition by the PL copyist.

<sup>9</sup> See the passage cited in the next paragraph. I thank Robert Lerner for catching this clue to the work's date, which revises previous scholars' assumption of a composition in 1382.

<sup>10</sup> B. Capasso, "Le fonti della storia delle provincie napoletane dal 568 al 1500," *ASPN* 1 (1876), 597.

is, in fact, a copy of that edition.<sup>11</sup> It appears, therefore, to have been “discovered” by the *Cronaca*’s fifteenth-century editor and treated by him as an integral piece of the *Cronaca*.

Whether its author intended it as such is less obvious. The text as we have it includes no introduction or conclusion betraying its author’s purpose, and the fact that it backtracks chronologically with respect to the *Cronaca* could be interpreted as denoting an independent compositional effort. However, its first chapter speaks of “leaving the foregoing material” and “returning” to the subject of Charles II, a phrasing that only makes sense if the author conceived of his work as a continuation of the *Cronaca*, which had reached the reign of Joanna I.<sup>12</sup> A later passage of the “Later Angevin Chronicle” confirms this supposition, and merits citing in full:

According to the aforementioned prophecy, it was said that in the castle [dell’Ovo] there was an egg placed in a carafe, and when the carafe with the egg broke the castle should fall. And this almost happened, for when master Ambrose, natural son of the duke of Milan, was a prisoner in the Castel dell’Ovo, and in fleeing broke the egg, all the ancient buildings of the castle fell, and the queen had it rebuilt more beautifully and better than it had been before. And so that the castle would not lose its name, she had the egg enclosed in a more beautiful, appropriate, and delicate glass vase, better than it had been before.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> The sixteenth-century manuscript copy of this edition, given the *siglum* N3, is discussed in Chapter Six below.

<sup>12</sup> “È de necessitate donare ali lecturi recreatione et lasare la preposata materia et retornare ad Carlo secondo ...” Cited from the *editio princeps* on the unnumbered folio 46<sup>r</sup>. This chapter, here numbered 78, is missing from the edition of Antonio Altamura, which included the “Later Angevin Chronicle” as “Book III” of the *Cronaca di Partenope*. Curiously, the following chapter of the *editio princeps* (i.e. chapter 2 of the “Later Angevin Chronicle”) bears the chapter heading “Cronica del re Roberto che fe per recuperare la insula de Sicilia.” If the heading was penned by the Later Angevin Chronicler himself, he must have intended it only as a heading for this one chapter, since it neither starts his original narrative nor describes the extent of his narrative, which continues well past Robert’s reign. If it was an intervention by the editor, Francesco del Tупpo, he apparently also considered it simply a chapter heading, for he treated it graphically as such and proceeded with his continuous chapter numeration, designating this one chapter 79.

<sup>13</sup> “Iuxta li paroli prophetiche dicte inanci dicivase che in dello dicto castello ce era uno ovo posto dentro una carrafa et como se rompiva la dicta carrafa con lo ovo deviva cadere lo dicto castello la quale cosa quasi cosi fo per che quando missere Ambroso figliolo naturale dello duca da Milan era presone in lo castello delovo et fugendose roppe lo dicto ovo et tutti li edifici antiqui delo dicto castello derupparo et la dicta Regina de novo lo fece edificare piu bello et migliore che era primo et che non avesse perduto lo nomo dello dicto castello fece include lo ovo in uno vassello de vetro piu bello et piu

If we assume, with Bartolomeo Capasso and other scholars, that the “Later Angevin Chronicle” is a reliable account of later-Trecento events in Naples, we have here a testament to the continuing currency of the Virgilian legends. In terms of the legacy of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, the crucial phrase is “according to the aforementioned prophecy.” Though the “Later Angevin Chronicle” had occasion to mention the Castel dell’Ovo several times in earlier chapters, it never mentioned this prophecy: “aforementioned” must therefore refer to a different work which preceded his own account—surely the *Cronaca di Partenope*, which describes this prophecy in chapter 30 (31B). In light of these clues, other similarities between the *Cronaca* and the “Later Angevin Chronicle” appear less accidental: the attention to physical monuments in the city, for instance, and especially the list of officials appointed by Joanna I, so reminiscent of Bartolomeo’s lists of the counts and officials made by her three Angevin predecessors. If the fifteenth-century editor of the *Cronaca* discovered this work, then, it would appear that he discovered it in a manuscript containing both texts, perhaps even the autograph in which the Later Angevin Chronicler appended his continuation to Bartolomeo’s work.

During the same decades in which the Later Angevin Chronicler was at work, another historically minded author composed a Latin history known as the *Cronicon Siculum*. Principally focused on Naples’ rulers up to 1396, this work contains great detail from 1383 forward, and may have been written in phases over several years.<sup>14</sup> Its history and legacy

---

acto sottile migliore che non era primo.” Cited from the *editio princeps* at chapter 117. The chapter number reflects this edition’s continuous chapter numeration from the start of the *Cronaca di Partenope*. The chapter appears, with minor variations, as Book III, chapter 50, in the edition of Antonio Altamura, *La Cronaca di Partenope* (Naples, 1974), 166–167.

<sup>14</sup> See the edition of Giuseppe de Blasiis, *Cronicon Siculum incerti auctoris ab anno 340 ad annum 1396* (Naples, 1887). In his analysis of the work’s date (ix–x), De Blasiis notes that an early passage of the work, narrating the death of Catherine de Courtenay in 1346, refers to Philip II of Taranto as “nunc imperatorem.” Since Philip died in 1373, the reference would seem to predate his death. However, since it was actually Philip’s elder brother Robert who claimed, through his mother Catherine de Courtenay, the title of emperor of Constantinople, the *Cronicon* author does not seem to be very well informed, calling into the question the notion that this passage was composed during Philip’s lifetime. Furthermore, the author may only have meant that with Catherine’s death Philip *became* emperor, not that he was *still* emperor at the time of writing (the relevant passage is on pp. 10–11 of de Blasiis’ edition). It therefore seems safer to assume a date of completion soon after 1396, while still considering the possibility of composition over a period of some years.

are almost as complicated as those of the *Cronaca di Partenope*. It survives in only a single manuscript copy, Vat. Ottob. 2940. Its nineteenth-century editor, Giuseppe de Blasiis, believed that the manuscript is not an autograph on account of errors and corrections in the text. There are several reasons to believe that it might be an autograph, however. First, the errors and corrections in the *Cronicon Siculum* can be explained by the author's use of the *Cronaca di Partenope* as a source (a fact of which de Blasiis was unaware), rather than by faults of a later copyist.<sup>15</sup> Secondly, the *Cronicon Siculum* is followed in this manuscript by another work that de Blasiis himself judged to be a draft version of the *Cronicon*. The preservation of a draft version is reasonable in an autograph and less likely in a later copy. Third, the other contents of this manuscript, including the "Pactum Sergii" (the agreement by which the last duke of Naples conceded authority of the city to Neapolitan noblemen) and the account of the Saracen seige (also found in the *Cronaca di Partenope* chapter 50 [52B]) bespeak the collection of a local historian like the author of the *Cronicon Siculum*.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, there are further connections between these texts. While a copy of the "Pactum Sergii" was found, according to the rubric in this manuscript, "in the house of Ligorio Brancaccio-Zoso," the death in 1344 of another member of this lineage, Giovanni Zoso, is recorded in the *Cronicon Siculum*.<sup>17</sup> De Blasiis asserted that its author was definitely Neapolitan, and very likely from the *seggio* of Capuana or Nido.<sup>18</sup> Given the texts' links to the Brancaccio family, it is possible he was a Brancaccio himself. In any case he was clearly well informed about and interested in men of Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa's generation and status-group.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> The principal hand sometimes added narrative in the margin because he had neglected to copy the passage (derived, like the main text surrounding it, from the *Cronaca*) at the appropriate place. Such is the case for the addition placed in square brackets and footnoted "1" on p. 3 of de Blasiis' edition. Sometimes the marginal narrative represents an original addition to a main text that faithfully follows the *Cronaca*, as in the bracketed narrative denoted by footnote 3 on the same page, or that denoted by footnote 1 on pp. 5–6.

<sup>16</sup> The inclusion of the Saracen seige text in this manuscript, on fols. 69 ff., is mentioned in Bartolomeo Capasso, "Le fonti della la storia delle provincie napoletane dal 568 al 1500," *ASPN* 1 (1876), 593n.

<sup>17</sup> Giuseppe de Blasiis, ed., *Cronicon Siculum*, 9, n. 7.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, vii–x.

<sup>19</sup> The *Cronicon* describes Giovanni Zoso as dying in a fight pitting members of the *seggio* of Nido against those of Portonova and Porto in 1344: "Eodem anno die XXIII augusti in vigilia sancti Bartholomei de nocte nobiles platee Nidi preliaverunt cum illis de Portanova et Porto, et eos vincerunt in curti Iohannis maioris; prelio mortuus fuit

The author of the *Cronicon Siculum* certainly knew Bartolomeo's work, for he used it as a source for early chapters of his own history. He opens by listing the various lords of southern Italy before the Normans' arrival, as does chapter 56 of the *Cronaca di Partenope*. But in noting that Naples itself had previously been under imperial rule, he adds information about the emperor Constantine's leprosy, conversion to Christianity, and Donation, in which Constantine reserved the city of Naples for his own jurisdiction and use—in other words, the information found in the *Cronaca* chapter 40. The assertion that the *Cronicon Siculum* copied only the last, "royal" section of the *Cronaca* (lending weight to the notion that this section, called "Part II" by earlier scholars, was distinct from "Part I") is therefore false: the author of the *Cronicon Siculum* must have read the entire text, and collated information from early and late chapters to fill out his description of the region before it was united into a single kingdom. Nor does the *Cronicon Siculum* faithfully copy the *Cronaca di Partenope*'s account of the pre-Norman region. It changes the sequence of southern Italian territories, and adds a good deal of information not found in Bartolomeo's work: on the history and lords of Amalfi, Troia, and Capua before Robert Guiscard's arrival, and on the duchy of Benevento.

Thereafter, the *Cronicon Siculum* faithfully translates the remaining chapters of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, but adds to it extensive passages, particularly on the careers of Robert Guiscard and Frederick II. It also adds two paragraphs on Charles II's battles with rebel Sicily, inserted between its translation of the *Cronaca* chapters 72 and 73.<sup>20</sup> None of this added narrative resembles the similarly extended account found in the Group B version of the *Cronaca di Partenope*. It represents instead another late-fourteenth-century historian's own research and memory, similarly focused on the careers of the realm's kings.

---

Iohannes Zozus" (ed. cit., p. 9). Though it is not clear from this passage to which *seggio* Giovanni himself belonged, it was very likely Nido, given the high status of the Brancaccio family. Giovanni was thus a contemporary of Bartolomeo and very likely a member of the same *seggio*.

<sup>20</sup> The *Cronicon Siculum* follows the *Cronaca di Partenope* fairly faithfully, albeit with additions, to page 7 of de Blasiis' edition. The borrowings end with the notice of the succession of Joanna I (i.e. the final chapter 75 of the *Cronaca*), lacking only mention of Louis of Taranto: "Cui regi Roberto successit in dominio domina nostra regina Iohnna filia quondam illustris domini Caroli ducis Calabrie, filii primogeniti predicti domini regis Roberti."

Three things are worth highlighting about the *Cronicon Siculum*'s textual borrowing. First, because it was composed in Latin, it represents the first known translation of (part of) the *Cronaca di Partenope* from the vernacular into Latin. To the extent that Latin was still considered the more authoritative language, then, the "elevation" of Bartolomeo's work into this idiom was already underway before 1400. Second, the *Cronicon Siculum* took considerable liberties in its translation of the earlier work. Like the "SV" author, we have here an "active" copyist/borrower who amplified and made original even his borrowed material. Third, although the *Cronicon Siculum* survives in a single manuscript, it had a legacy of its own. Marginal comments added in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries indicate that this manuscript itself continued to be read and amplified, and it was consulted and cited by southern Italian historians of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>21</sup>

Finally, some evidence suggests the existence of a work standing between the *Cronaca di Partenope* and the *Cronicon Siculum*. This evidence involves two late manuscripts. The first is a historical compendium completed around 1571 by Gaspare Fuscolillo, canon of Sessa.<sup>22</sup> This compendium includes three vernacular chronicles, of which the third, entitled "Cronaca del Regno di Napoli," is of interest here, as well as a short Latin history of the kingdom from the foundation of the southern Italian monarchy to the rebellion of Sicily in 1282, which occupies the manuscript's first four folios. Bartolomeo Capasso considered the "Cronaca del Regno di Napoli" to be, in part, a copy of "Part II" of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, that is, the section on Naples' royal history that Capasso considered an independent work. As for the Latin text, Capasso thought it was the original source of this "Part II."<sup>23</sup>

The Latin text and the early chapters (fols. 67<sup>r</sup>–77<sup>r</sup>) of Fuscolillo's "Cronaca del Regno di Napoli" are closely related, but neither is a copy of or source for Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa's work. Indeed, they are much closer to the *Cronicon Siculum* just discussed. Both start with the lords of the various provinces of southern Italy before the Normans'

---

<sup>21</sup> De Blasiis, ed. cit., viii, noting its citation in Scipione Ammirato's *Delle famiglie nobili napoletane* of 1580 and in Stefano Borgia's three-volume *Memorie storiche della città pontificia di Benevento* (Rome, 1763–1769). The marginalia by fifteenth- and sixteenth-century hands are noted in the footnotes to the edition itself.

<sup>22</sup> This manuscript is Naples, Società napoletana di storia patria, XIII AA 39, given the siglum SN<sub>3</sub> in Chapter Six below.

<sup>23</sup> Bartolomeo Capasso, "Le 'Cronache de li antiqui ri del regno di Napoli' di D. Gaspare Fuscolillo," *ASPN* 1 (1876), 35–43.

arrival, but insert an account of the emperor Constantine's leprosy, cure, and Donation, just as the *Cronicon Siculum* did. The series of provinces, too, is much closer to the *Cronicon Siculum* than to Bartolomeo's work. In Fuscolillo's vernacular work, the series is identical except for the omission of Benevento; in the Latin text, the first three and last five provinces appear in the same order as the *Cronicon Siculum*. Yet both works in this manuscript also retain features of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, which, of course, was the *Cronicon Siculum*'s own source. The Latin work begins just like chapter 56 of the *Cronaca di Partenope*: "antequam regnum Sicilie esset integratum et unitam erant diversi domini qui dominabantur diversis provinciis prout infra scribitur." And both works in this manuscript end the chapter in a way much closer to the *Cronaca di Partenope*, omitting the detailed narrative on Robert Guiscard found in the *Cronicon Siculum*.<sup>24</sup>

This brief textual comparison suggests that Gaspare drew on a work similar to the *Cronicon Siculum*, but lacking its extensive additional narrative and retaining some features of the *Cronicon Siculum*'s own source, the *Cronaca di Partenope*. In other words, Gaspare's manuscript seems to be a late witness to the existence of a work standing between the *Cronaca di Partenope* and the *Cronicon Siculum*: one that excerpted only the final chapters of Bartolomeo's work (with the additional information on Constantine drawn from chapter 40 of the *Cronaca di Partenope*) and that reordered the series of pre-Norman provinces, but did not yet feature narrative on the province of Benevento, which is found only in the *Cronicon Siculum*, nor the additional historical narrative also found only in the latter work. In that case we have testimony to yet another late-fourteenth-century reworking of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, whose influence is seen in the *Cronicon Siculum* and, much later, in Gaspare Fuscolillo's historical compendium.

Indeed, it may be that folios 80<sup>v</sup>–87<sup>v</sup> of another manuscript, Naples, Bib. Naz., X C 31, preserve this intermediate work.<sup>25</sup> It was copied even later than Fuscolillo's compendium, probably well into the seventeenth century, in the vernacular. It too has been considered, incorrectly, a

---

<sup>24</sup> The Latin work paraphrases the *Cronaca di Partenope*'s conclusion to chapter 56 and opening of chapter 57, noting that "after the arrival of Robert Guiscard and eleven brothers from Normandy, Robert acquired the whole realm except Naples and expelled the region's various princes and dukes." The vernacular text ends just like chapter 56 of the *Cronaca di Partenope*: "and after the arrival of Robert Guiscard [Sicily] was made into a county and Robert entitled his brother Roger count of Sicily."

<sup>25</sup> This copy is designated with the *siglum* N4 in Chapter Six below.



direct copy of “Part II” of the *Cronaca di Partenope*. Like the *Cronicon Siculum* and both Fuscolillo texts, it inserts the information on emperor Constantine in its list of pre-Norman provinces. It opens with the original opening lines of the *Cronaca di Partenope* chapter 56 (like the Fuscolillo Latin text), then follows the exact series of pre-Norman provinces found in the *Cronicon Siculum* except for Benevento, and closes the chapter in the same way as the *Cronaca di Partenope* (in both these features resembling the Fuscolillo vernacular text). The end of the narrative adds commentary on the virtues of Joanna I’s father, Duke Charles of Calabria, and on the death of Joanna’s husband Andrew of Hungary, passages not found in the *Cronaca di Partenope*. Significantly, the copyist added a marginal comment alongside these final lines, noting *in altro scritto antico segue e finisce cosi: è la mogliera dello nostro signore re Luise* (“in another old text [the narrative] continues and finishes thus: ‘she is the wife of our lord king Louis’”). This marginal comment offers the original ending of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, indicating that the X C 31 copyist compared his exemplar to a copy of our work. Since the original always bore the colophon identifying Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa as its author, this comparison also explains the title to the work provided in this manuscript: “Chronicon de Bartolomeo Carazzuolo.”

The foregoing paragraphs explain why, in Chapter Six below, I remove the Fuscolillo manuscript and X C 31 from the list of copies of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, and why they cannot be treated as evidence of the independent circulation of the latter section (“Part II”) of our work. These works do, however, offer evidence of the later influence of the *Cronaca*. Despite their late date, these two manuscripts are very likely testament to another fourteenth-century reworking of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, one predating and influencing the composition of the *Cronicon Siculum*.

All told, the fourteenth century now emerges as a period of significant historiographical production in and around Naples. In the half-century after the completion of the *Cronaca di Partenope* we find the “Southernized Villani,” the Group B version of the *Cronaca* itself, a continuation in the form of the “Later Angevin Chronicle,” the *Cronicon Siculum*, and very likely a work intermediate between the *Cronaca di Partenope* and the *Cronicon Siculum*, now transmitted only in much later manuscripts. To these we could add the *Chronicon de rebus Neapolitanis* of the late-fourteenth-century poet and writer Guglielmo Maramauro, now lost.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> On this work see Sabatini, *Napoli angioina*, 125.

All these works (apart from Guglielmo's, of which we can know almost nothing) were demonstrably indebted to the *Cronaca di Partenope*, which was, of course, the first local history Naples had known in over four centuries. Its role as the progenitor of a historiographical tradition was already secured within a half-century of its composition.

If we turn now to the fifteenth century, we will see that role grow yet further. The “short” fifteenth century—that is, the period from circa 1400 to the publication of the first edition in 1486–1490—produced most of the manuscript copies of *Cronaca* that have come down to us: two copies of the Group B version (E and VZ), and seven copies of the original version.<sup>27</sup> The latter indicate that transformations of the *Cronaca* certainly did not end with the massive changes wrought by the Group B progenitor. The copyist of manuscript F, working in the Abruzzi around the 1440s, made significant changes to the section of the *Cronaca* dealing with Naples' early Christian and early-medieval history. One episode—the account in chapter 50 of Saint Gaudiosus, a sixth-century refugee from Christian North Africa who founded a monastery in Naples—was entirely removed. Otherwise the content of the rewritten chapters (principally 34 through 50) remains substantially the same, but the language is greatly modified, sometimes significantly condensing the standard narrative and sometimes simply paraphrasing it. The effort involved in this work suggests the copyist's considerable interest in this period of Neapolitan history.

An even more dramatic transformation is seen in V, a manuscript roughly coeval with F. As noted in Chapter Six below, this copy features a unique paraphrase of the “royal” section of the *Cronaca*, from chapter 56 forward. A particular interest in the lords of southern Italy before the region's unification is suggested by the double copying of chapter 56, the second time in list form, presumably for ease of reference. But special interest in all of southern Italy's royal period is suggested by the effort of paraphrasing and reorganizing this whole section of the work.

To judge from the *Cronaca* manuscripts, around the middle of the fifteenth century it became common for southern Italian copyists to identify themselves and the circumstances of their scribal work. The

---

<sup>27</sup> These are: P1, M1, E, V, N1, N2, and P2. SN1 may be a fifteenth-century manuscript (it was likely completed between 1497 and 1504), but I omit it from the following discussion, since it certainly postdates the publication of the first edition in 1486–1490. Similarly, M2, though a fifteenth-century manuscript, is omitted because it not only postdates the first edition but is a copy (with additions by its copyist) of the edition itself.

earliest *Cronaca* manuscript to do so was N2, which is both a very partial copy of our text and a manuscript in such poor condition that it can no longer be reproduced or consulted firsthand. Happily, Alfonso Paoella, who was able to consult the manuscript in the early 1990s, offers some information on its principal copyist. This copyist identifies himself on fol. 128<sup>r</sup> as Vinciguerra *de Podio de Marsico* and gives the year in which he completed his work as 1451. As Paoella observes, Vinciguerra was probably not from Marsico in the province of Potenza, but rather from the region of la Marsica in the Abruzzi, given his use of orthographical forms peculiar to this region. (A number of toponyms in la Marsica end with “Poggio” (= *de Podio*), lending further weight to this provenance).<sup>28</sup> The lost manuscript VZ is even less forthcoming: it tells us only that its copyist was Tommaso *Cazapoto*, who finished his work on the eve of All Saints’ Day 1471. N1, copied in the same year 1471, gives more information: Pietro de Aliberto described himself as a notary of the barony of San Severino, working “at the request of the magnificent lord Alessandro Mazza,” a knight of Salerno who was, in 1471, the viceprince of the barony. Paoella, who studied this manuscript too, has noted that the prince of the barony at this time was Roberto Sanseverino, one of the most powerful lords of southern Italy, whose court was frequented by artists and learned men and to whom Pontano dedicated a work in 1472. It may be, therefore, that his viceprince Alessandro Mazza commissioned this manuscript in emulation of his lord.<sup>29</sup> Finally, the copyist of P2, who worked in 1479, also identified himself. He was Berardo de Turricella, a scribe in the chancery of Tommaso *de Chiavellis* of Fabriano. He wrote “in the name of,” and thus probably at the request of, Matteo de Montecello, “leader of the royal armies,” whom Berardo describes as his lord. Limited though it is, this evidence of the *Cronaca*’s fifteenth-century scribes and owners clearly indicates that it circulated in the provinces of southern Italy and was sought by men of a fairly high stature in baronial and royal service.

In fact, the *Cronaca* circulated at the highest levels of southern Italian society, for two fifteenth-century copies made their way into the collection of the Aragonese royal family itself. One of those copies was P2, originally made, as we have seen, for a military captain. Since the Angevin and Aragonese rulers sometimes appropriated the libraries of vassals when

---

<sup>28</sup> Alfonso Paoella, ed., *Volgarizzamento meridionale anonimo di Francesco Petrarca, Itinerarium breve de Ianua usque ad Ierusalem et Terram Sanctam* (Bologna, 1993), xxvii.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, xxvii–xxix.

confiscating their other possessions, P2 may have reached the royal collection in this way.<sup>30</sup> P1, though devoid of information about its original copyist and owner, also came into the collection of the Aragonese, suggesting that its owner too was of sufficiently high status to have some connection with the crown. If they were confiscated or (as seems less likely) presented as gifts to the crown, they do not denote any particular royal interest in the codices' contents. But a third copy, now in Modena (E), belonged to the Aragonese and was very likely made for them, with its luxurious binding and illumination similar to other royal codices.<sup>31</sup> It is tempting to surmise that, having learned of the work through copies obtained from vassals like Matteo de Montecello, the crown commissioned a fresh copy of its own (a different version, as it turns out, E being one of the Group B texts), but exactly how and in what order these copies reached the royal library cannot be known. What we do know is that P1 and P2 were among the 1,140 codices of the Aragonese library pilaged by the French king Charles VIII in his conquest of Naples in 1495, and included in the French royal library by the end of Charles IX's reign, whence they passed to the Bibliothèque nationale de France.<sup>32</sup> As for E, it must have left the Aragonese library before Charles VIII's despoliation in 1495. Given the very close ties between the Aragonese and the d'Este in these decades, it was probably a gift to Ercole d'Este from the Aragonese court.<sup>33</sup>

Though a self-described history "of the city of Naples," the *Cronaca's* appeal to southern Italians beyond Naples is understandable. The focus on southern Italian kings in its last eleven chapters (or in the Group B version, thirty chapters) made it to some extent a history of the realm, not just the city. Furthermore, the increasingly close identification of city and realm, especially as Neapolitan patricians entered the ranks of the feudal nobility and non-Neapolitan feudal nobility acquired residences in the capital, made even a civic history of this particular city a

---

<sup>30</sup> Giuseppe Mazzatinti, *La biblioteca dei re d'Aragona in Napoli* (Rocca San Casciano, 1897), xxvi, lii–lvii.

<sup>31</sup> The original binding, replaced in the eighteenth century, was described in an early catalog as "cum superficie membranorum exteriori deaurata, in tegmine ligneo corio caelaturis deauratis ornato, aereisque fibulis instructo." *Ibid.*, 175–176. Mazzatinti suggested it was the codex copied in 1487 for Alfonso, Duke of Calabria, though Tammaro de Marinis has disagreed: see Chapter Six at nn. 22–23.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, i (on Charles VIII's despoliation of the Aragonese library), 175–176 (on P1 and E), 180 (on P2).

<sup>33</sup> See Chapter Six at n. 23.

subject of much wider appeal. This gradual fusion of Neapolitan patriariate and feudal nobility was underway already in the later fourteenth century, but well established, according to Giuliana Vitale, only from the mid-fifteenth century.<sup>34</sup> It may be significant in this regard that our “provincial” manuscripts all date from the 1440s and later. Though we know little about manuscript diffusion in the fourteenth and early fifteenth century, the Neapolitan character of the writers who borrowed from the *Cronaca*, as well as the Campanian focus of the texts with which it circulated in manuscript, suggest that before that time its circulation may have been more local. In this regard it is worth mentioning another clue to its local audience in the earliest fifteenth century. In 1409, the Neapolitan notary and local historian Ruggiero Pappansogna compiled a document listing the possessions of the Neapolitan church of San Giovanni Maggiore. He prefaced this list with a story of the church’s origins. And the story he told was of Constantine’s and his daughter Constance’s double foundation of the church, found for the first time in the *Cronaca di Partenope* and very likely borrowed by Ruggiero from that work.<sup>35</sup>

Shortly before Charles VIII’s brief conquest of Naples, the *Cronaca* underwent its first printed edition.<sup>36</sup> Though its editor and date are not stated in the publication itself, scholars have identified it as the work of Francesco del Tупpo, printed in Naples between 1486 and 1490. Francesco, like his father, was a *popolano* from the *seggio* of Porto and a scribe in royal service. Thanks to his father’s success in acquiring a

---

<sup>34</sup> Giuliana Vitale, *Élite burocratica e famiglia. Dinamiche nobiliari e processi di costruzione statale nella Napoli angioina-aragonese* (Naples, 2003), 30–31.

<sup>35</sup> B. Capasso, *Topografia della città di Napoli nel secolo XI* (Naples, 1895; repr. 1984), 84–85. Capasso provides no source for his description of this document, but a similar account of it is given in Cesare d’Engenio Caracciolo, *Napoli sacra* (Naples, 1623), in his entry on San Giovanni Maggiore. According to him, an “ancient parchment book held in this church, extracted from the Register of Charles I by the notary Ruggier Pappansogna, gentleman of the Seggio of Montagna at the order of King Ladislas in 1409,” confirmed the foundation story with these words: “Constantinus primus Christianus imperator Neapolim maritimo itinere adveniēns applicavit in regionem Sedilis Portus ubi dicitur ad ripam, ibidem fundavit ecclesiam magnam . . . quae postquam perfecte consumata est, per sanctissimum papam Silvestrum consecrata est, per quem etiam oratorium S.M. del Principio dedicatum est . . .” In another context, Bartolomeo Capasso noted that Ruggiero composed a *Cronaca delle famiglie del Seggio di Montagna* before 1408: see “Le fonti della storia,” 601n.

<sup>36</sup> G.M. Monti noted four copies of the first edition: Naples, Società napoletana di storia patria, XXII E 4, and three in Naples’ Biblioteca Nazionale: S Q IX B 3, XIV B 46, and L V A 8, the last two mutilated. I have consulted a fifth copy belonging to the John Rylands Library of the University of Manchester, England via a photostat owned by the Morgan Library of New York.

position in Alfonso I's new Aragonese administration, Francesco grew up at court and received his education there, and as an adult worked not only as a scribe but as a bookseller and publisher. Despite his connections to court and to distinguished patricians of his day, to whom he dedicated many of his editions, he achieved neither fame nor fortune: his financial affairs seem always to have been precarious, and he last enters the historical record when sued by his own daughter and son-in-law for the dowry he owed them. These conditions may explain why he focused much of his publishing activity on practical works, mostly juridical texts for use by students. His decision to publish vernacular literature of the fourteenth century, including Dante's *Commedia*, Boccaccio's *Fiammetta* and *Filocolo*, and of course the *Cronaca di Partenope*, may also have been motivated by a belief in the market for such works. His own learning has been described as typical of the fourteenth century, without the deep familiarity with and interest in antiquity that characterized the humanists of his own time. Though he intended to write a Latin work on Aesop, for instance, his consciousness that "as a Latin writer he could not compete with, nor even distantly compare himself to the Neapolitan humanists, great and small" led him to simply translate Aesop's fables from Latin into the vernacular, alongside a biography of the fabulist.<sup>37</sup>

The notion that Francesco was an accomplished humanist whose choice of base manuscript for the *Cronaca* carries authority, therefore, must be rejected.<sup>38</sup> Indeed, this conclusion could be reached even without knowledge of Francesco's own culture, since we can now identify his base manuscript as one containing a copy of the redacted, "Group B" version of the *Cronaca*, followed by the "Later Angevin Chronicle" that Francesco published as part of the *Cronaca*. Given that the "Later Angevin Chronicle" appears to have been the unique continuation of a single manuscript owner, Francesco's choice does not suggest an editor who undertook serious comparison of multiple manuscript copies. Indeed, it suggests he consulted no other copies at all. Further, since he retained in his edition a heading identifying a middle chapter as the start of "Book Eight"—a holdover from the passage's original context in Giovanni Villani's *Nuova Cronica*, and one that made no sense in its new place within the Group B

<sup>37</sup> Alfredo Mauro, *Francesco del Toppo e il suo 'Esopo'* (Città del Castello, 1926), provides the most thorough biography; see esp. 79–80 and 100 on his culture, and 89–90 on his vernacular publications.

<sup>38</sup> Antonio Altamura, ed., *La Cronaca di Partenope*, 47; Monti, "La 'Cronaca di Partenope,'" 59.

version of the *Cronaca di Partenope*—Francesco does not appear to have concerned himself much with the internal coherence of the work he published either.

What Francesco did apparently recognize—or perhaps gleaned from comments made by the copyist of his exemplar—was that some of the material in this work came from Villani’s *Nuova Cronica*. In the introductory paragraph that he added to the *Cronaca*, he identifies Villani as the author of the entire *Cronaca di Partenope*: “Here begins a very noble and true chronicle composed by the most generous Master Giovanni Villano, collected from many ancient [authors], which is delightful and very pleasurable for knowledge of the ancient history of the kingdom of Sicily on the mainland and the island [*citra et ultra el faro*].” Thus was inaugurated a false attribution that survived until the nineteenth century, resulting in much confusion about the identity of our text and its author. Francesco del Tuppo’s inclusion of the “Later Angevin Chronicle” as a final section of the *Cronaca* was equally influential, inspiring later scholars to treat the latter work in their discussions of the *Cronaca* (and thus to consider the *Cronaca* itself an “agglomeration of various chronicles”) despite clear evidence of its character as a unique continuation of a preexisting work.<sup>39</sup>

By concluding with Francesco del Tuppo’s edition of 1486–1490 I do not mean to imply that the influence of the *Cronaca di Partenope* diminished thereafter, nor even that its later fortunes were determined principally by this edition. The original version continued to be copied in manuscript, sometimes with interesting additions by the copyists themselves, and Group B manuscripts too were carefully preserved and reconstituted by their owners, without any signs of having consulted a published edition.<sup>40</sup> In some respects the first printed edition may be understood as perpetuating a preexisting manuscript tradition regarding the audience for the *Cronaca*, rather than inaugurating an entirely new phase of its reception. And certainly the *Cronaca* continued to exert influence on later historians, published and unpublished, as has been briefly mentioned in the introduction to this chapter and in the discussion of the later adaptations by Fuscolillo and by the copyist of MS Naples, Bib. Naz.,

<sup>39</sup> The phrase is Altamura’s (ed. cit., 41), but reflects a consensus opinion based on the quadripartite identification of the work: see Chapter Two above.

<sup>40</sup> The copyist of SN1, for instance (1497–1504), added to the *Cronaca* several pieces of information of his own devising, and a sixteenth-century owner of PL, finding the first folios of his copy mutilated, reconstituted the text on blank folios at the start of the manuscript, without any evident recourse to a printed edition. On these idiosyncrasies see Chapter Six below.

X C 31. By focusing on the period up to 1486 I hope simply to have cast some light on the least understood period of the work's diffusion, to have illustrated the breadth of its influence in the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and to have indicated some of the creative adaptations made by copyists and fellow historians of this age. Their adaptations echo and extend those made by Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa himself in his treatment of his own source-texts, and illustrate the potential rewards of examining a single text as part of a continuum stretching for many centuries in both chronological directions.





## chapter six

### MANUSCRIPTS

#### *Description of Manuscripts and Early Editions*

Most of the manuscripts below were identified by Bartolomeo Capasso and his successors, and their discoveries, as well as their identification of the manuscripts' other contents and opinions on dating, have laid an indispensable foundation for serious study of the *Cronaca*. Their catalogue of manuscript contents, however, is frequently in error; some texts identified as the *Cronaca* are in fact later adaptations of it; and two copies eluded their attention. In what follows I include all copies mentioned by previous scholars of the *Cronaca* (whether actually containing the *Cronaca* or not) as well as the two hitherto known only to scholars of other works contained in these manuscripts. Of these nineteen copies, twelve are important textual witnesses that serve as the basis for the present edition, and two more, though no longer available for consultation, are incomplete copies of the *Cronaca* that can be known now only through earlier scholars' descriptions of them. Another pair are copies of early printed editions, which are further indices of the work's diffusion but of no use in establishing the text. Of the remaining three, two are not copies of the *Cronaca* at all but later adaptations of it, while the last has never been identified sufficiently to permit confirmation of its existence.

The twelve central textual witnesses are as follows, given (to the extent precise dating is possible) in chronological order.

PL = Palermo, Biblioteca centrale della regione siciliana (formerly Biblioteca nazionale), I D 14.

Circa 1400. Parchment, 62 folios, single column. This manuscript contains the *Cronaca* alone. G.M. Monti judged the hand to be of the later fourteenth century, with a *terminus post quem* of 1380 because that date appears in the text. Sabatini's dating to circa 1400 appears more accurate, given the regular semi-gothic script and well separated

letters.<sup>1</sup> The *Cronaca* introduction is rubricated, and initials for following chapters are in alternating red and blue; a few initials are missing. The first folio is mutilated at the edges and bears two large holes in the center. A later hand, probably of the late sixteenth century, recopied this first folio on an additional sheet at the start of the manuscript and made marginal comments throughout the text. This recopied page is faithful to the original folio where the original is sufficiently legible to compare them, but offers a number of unique readings at places where the parchment of the original is completely gone, suggesting that he did not collate with another copy but made his own best guess of the original.<sup>2</sup> The final folio is also mutilated at the outside top corner, resulting in the loss of one or two words in the first eight lines of 62<sup>r</sup> and 62<sup>v</sup>. The folio numeration is modern and consecutive, obscuring the loss of a folio between 56 and 57, whence the text lacks parts of two chapters. This manuscript may be the same one mentioned by Francescantonio Soria as belonging to the Jesuits of Palermo in the late eighteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Francesco Sabatini has noted its “hyper-Tuscanized” vernacular which “has almost totally erased phonetic traits typical of Neapolitan.”<sup>4</sup>

P1 = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, italien 304

Early 15th c. Paper, 4+99+4 fols., 2 columns. Capasso dated this copy of the *Cronaca* to the late fourteenth century. Based on paleographical indices, Monti dated it to the late fourteenth or earliest fifteenth century, but tended toward the latter because the copyist included the date 1480 in the text—certainly a mistake, but one suggesting to Monti that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Gennaro Maria Monti, “La ‘Cronaca di Partenope’ (Premessa all’edizione critica),” in idem, *Dai normanni agli aragonesi* (Trani, 1936), 35; Francesco Sabatini, *Napoli angioina. Cultura e società* (Naples, 1975) 135. I thank Fabio Troncarelli and Roberto Pesce for confirming Sabatini’s dating.

<sup>2</sup> Antonio Altamura thought the later copyist took his readings from the *editio princeps*: see his edition, *La Cronaca di Partenope* (Naples, 1974), 13. It is clear from the copied text that the PL copyist was merely trying to reconstitute the mutilated folio of PL itself. He frequently employs ellipses where PL’s original first folio was mutilated, and offers unique readings where the parchment of the original is completely gone: “Sicilia” for “Italia,” where only “-lia” is legible, in chapter 1, and “Chuma” for “Roma” in chapter 2. These readings are not found in the *editio princeps* or any other manuscript.

<sup>3</sup> Francescantonio Soria, *Memorie storico-critiche degli storici napoletani* (Naples, 1782), vol. 2, p. 645, noted by Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 35.

<sup>4</sup> Sabatini, *Napoli angioina*, 135.

copyist did live in the 1400s.<sup>5</sup> The earliest years of the fifteenth century, as proposed by Tammaro de Marinis, are therefore the most likely date of copying.<sup>6</sup> Four blank folios at the start and end of the manuscript bracket 79 numbered folios and another 20 blank, unlined folios. Of these ninety-nine central folios, the first twenty and last twenty were bound into the manuscript at a later moment. Folios 1<sup>r</sup>–19<sup>v</sup> contain a printed copy of the “Tractatus fidei” of Francesco da Gaeta, bishop of Squillace. De Marinis has suggested that the tract was printed in Naples, perhaps by Francesco del Tупpo, circa 1474–1477.<sup>7</sup> Among the final twenty folios appears a watermark similar to Briquet 11322 (Naples, 1478), lending support to the notion that these bracketing folios were bound with the older, central folios in Naples around this time.<sup>8</sup>

The original folios of the manuscript then begin with the bull of Pope Clement IV infeudating Charles of Anjou with the Kingdom of Sicily (21<sup>r</sup>–25<sup>r</sup>), with the same incipit, explicit, and identification of place and date as in manuscript M1 (see below). Folio 25<sup>v</sup> is blank. Next is an incomplete list of emperors and kings and their mode of coronation (fol. 26<sup>r</sup>), inc. “[ ]ohnus [sic] debet dominari omnibus regibus tocius mundi.” Some 22 lines are left blank in the middle of this brief work, and another seven at the end: cf. the text in manuscript M1 below. This is followed by a list of the churches of Rome and bishops of other provinces, inc. “In civitate romana sunt quinque ecclesie patriarchales,” expl. “cum omnibus montanis qui similiter pretenditur per unam dietam” (26<sup>r</sup>–31<sup>v</sup>). The *Cronaca di Partenope* occupies fols. 32<sup>r</sup>–42<sup>v</sup>, ending “Deo Gratias Amen” and leaving most of the second column blank. The last text in the manuscript is the “Southernized Villani” (fols. 43<sup>r</sup>–79<sup>v</sup>), inc. “Et ne pare convenebele.” The “Southernized Villani” text is incomplete, ending three lines into the (unnumbered) 149th chapter and with a vertical catchword at the bottom of 79<sup>v</sup>, thus indicating that succeeding folios have been lost. Sometime after 1442, when the Aragonese dynasty took control of southern Italy, the manuscript passed to the Aragonese royal library; it

<sup>5</sup> Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 36.

<sup>6</sup> Tammaro de Marinis, *La biblioteca napoletana de re d’Aragona*, 4 vols. (Milan, 1947), vol. 2, 56.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

<sup>8</sup> Charles-Moïse Briquet, *Les filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu’en 1600*, 4 vols. (Paris and Geneva, 1907; repr. Amsterdam 1968). Watermarks are described and dated in numerical order in vols. 1 and 2, and reproduced in the same numerical order in vols. 3 and 4.

was among those taken from the library by Charles VIII during his brief conquest of the city in 1495, whence it made its way to France.<sup>9</sup> Previous descriptions of the manuscript's contents are not reliable.<sup>10</sup>

M1 = New York, Morgan Library, M 973

c. 1438. Paper, 1 + 224 + 1 fols., 2 columns. The Morgan Library catalog entry dates the manuscript to the second quarter of the fifteenth century because its watermark is similar to Briquet 6306, used in Naples in 1438.<sup>11</sup> This watermark also suggests a provenance in or near Naples. This manuscript was unknown to previous scholars of the *Cronaca*, but is known to scholars of Peter of Eboli's *De balneis puteolanis*, a translation of which is also contained in this manuscript, and to Alfonso Paoletta, editor of the vernacular translation of Petrarch's *Itinerarium* also found here.<sup>12</sup> A table of contents, written in a modern Italian hand, occupies a

---

<sup>9</sup> G. Mazzatinti, *La biblioteca dei re d'Aragona in Napoli* (Rocca S. Casciano, 1897), 175–176. The final surviving folio (79<sup>v</sup>) bears the seal of the royal library of France, indicating that the manuscript was already mutilated by the time it reached this library.

<sup>10</sup> The best description is that of T. de Marinis (op. cit.), who however omits a few short works and does not note the incompleteness of the final work (the “Southernized Villani”). Monti gave the total folios of the manuscript alternately as 79 and as 150; Altamura repeated the latter number. Altamura also located the *Cronaca* on fols. 21<sup>r</sup> ff. See Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 36–37; Altamura, ed. *La Cronaca*, 15. I am grateful to Elizabeth A.R. Brown for an early physical description of the manuscript, which I was able to confirm later through firsthand consultation of the codex. The online catalog of the Bibliothèque nationale de France offers a very brief description, dating the manuscript to the fifteenth century, noting the title of its first text (“Tractatus fidei ubi est tota materia heresis”) and indicating that it was brought to France by Charles VIII. It offers a single bibliographical reference, to A. Marsand, *I manoscritti italiani della regia biblioteca parigina*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1835–1838), vol. 1, n. 379. Marsand here notes only the presence of an “antica storia della città di Napoli” from folio 32ff. (i.e. the *Cronaca di Partenope*), preceded by “varie altre cose latine,” and offers no information on provenance.

<sup>11</sup> See the online catalog of the Morgan Library, accessible via <http://corsair.morganlibrary.org>, where the entry for this manuscript can be found via a call number search for “MS M.0973.” The online catalog entry supersedes the hard-copy catalog entry, which however can be consulted in PDF form via a link in the online entry. The catalog description is not able to identify all contents and contains some errors, for instance describing the *Cronaca* as ending on fol. 57<sup>r</sup>, whereas it ends on fol. 50<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> I learned of this manuscript from Jean d'Amato Thomas, who kindly lent me a printout from microfilm before I obtained a new microfilm copy. It is also mentioned by Giovanna Gimigliano in the introduction to her online edition of the “Trattato dei Bagni” who credits Livio Petrucci with giving her the reference. (From the main site <http://www.nsula.edu/campaniafelix/introduction.asp>, follow the link to the “Trattato dei Bagni,” and thence to the “Introduzione,” where this manuscript bears the *siglum* M2.)

page pasted to the front cover. Another description, of only the central contents of the manuscript, occupies the unnumbered first folio (I<sup>r-v</sup>), written in Italian possibly in the nineteenth century. The rest is written in a neat fifteenth-century hand by a single copyist. Its contents are:

The bull of Pope Clement IV infeudating Charles I of Anjou with the realm of Sicily in 1265, “cum legibus et partibus in ea insertis” as a later hand noted in the upper margin, inc. “[E]xcellentissimi et magnifico principi domino Carulo illustri Regis Sicilie,” expl. “litteras sigillorum nostrorum minime roboratas vobis duximus concedendas,” followed by place and date, “Actum Rome apud Lateranum in basilica Salvatoris que appellatur Constanciana ante sacratissimum altare ipsius basilice, quarto kal. Julii anno domini M CC sexagesimo quinto pontificatus vero predicti domini Clementis pape quarti anno primo” (1<sup>r</sup>-11<sup>r</sup>).

A brief list of emperors and kings and their mode of coronation, bearing the title “De romano imperatore,” inc. “[R]omanus imperatore debet dominari omnibus regionibus totius mundi de iure” (11<sup>v</sup>-12<sup>r</sup>).

The same list of Roman churches and bishoprics of other regions found in P1, inc. “In civitate romana sunt quinque ecclesie patriarchales,” expl. “cum omnibus montanis que similiter pretenditur per unam dietam. Deo gracias. Amen. Finito libro, sit laus gloria xpo. Amen. Amen.” (12<sup>r</sup>-22<sup>r</sup>). Fol. 22<sup>v</sup> is blank.

The *Cronaca di Partenope* (fols. 23<sup>r</sup>-50<sup>v</sup>), inc. “De la cita de Napoli,” expl. “cavaliere de Napoli. Deo Gracias. Amen.” The remainder of fol. 50<sup>v</sup> is blank. A later hand has written in the upper margin of fol. 23<sup>r</sup>, “Chronica Joannis Villani ex veteribus excerpta.”

The “Southernized Villani” in 168 chapters, inc. “Et ne pare convenebele,” expl. “et arrivoy in Calabria et poy sende tornoy ad Napoli” (fols. 51<sup>r</sup>-154<sup>v</sup>).

The “Universal Villani Excerpt” in 59 chapters, inc. “[P]oi troviamo per la storia dela Biblia,” expl. “mercatanti de Bruges erano tucti dele parte delo re de Franca unde lo dicto Re” (fols. 155<sup>r</sup>-187<sup>r</sup>). Folio 187<sup>v</sup> is blank.

---

Curt Bühler, curator of the Morgan Library, did not mention it in his article on another manuscript copy of the *Cronaca* (identified as M2 below). A description is provided by Alfonso Paoletta, ed., *Volgarizzamento meridionale anonimo di Francesco Petrarca, Itinerarium breve de Ianua usque ad Ierusalem et Terram Sanctam* (Bologna, 1993), xlv-xlvi.

A treatise given the title “Sito et conditione de Campania” by G.M. Monti.<sup>13</sup> Here the title reads, “Qui se narra lo sito et le condiciune de Canpagnya et le persecucione che ave havute in deversi tempi et la donacione che ne fece Costantino ala ecclesia,” inc. “Canpagnya si è la septima provincia de Ytalia,” expl. “dalo dicto imperatore et dentro Roma male securo per le tartari” (188<sup>r</sup>–193<sup>r</sup>). Fol. 193<sup>v</sup> is blank.

A list of the kings of ancient Israel and legendary king-progenitors of various peoples, entitled “Qui se narrano tucti li ri judey che foro nelo vecchyto testamento dalo primo fine allultimo et quanto tempo regnaro,” inc. “[C]onvenebele et raysonebele cosa si ey che nuy si debiamo tractare dela nobele gesta brevemente deli gran facti li quali se fecero li nobili ri judey,” expl. “et tucte queste XII generacione de gente lequale nominate avimo foro et so xpiani bapticzati et fidelissimi ala fede de nostro signyore Jhu xpo loquale regna et regnarra in secula seculorum. Amen. Amen” (194<sup>r</sup>–196<sup>r</sup>).

Two poems. The first bears the title “Quisto e uno lamento che fa la ecclesia de Roma de papa Gregorio et Roma anche se rechyama,” inc. “Pieta pieta pieta o summo Iove,” expl. “di te se dirra male senza menzognya. Deo gracias. Amen.” After a break of two lines appears the second poem, inc. “Amore ihu perchel sangue spandisti/ per me malvaso ingrato et sconossente ...” expl. “contemplativo e pien damerosanza. Deo gracias. Amen” (fols. 196<sup>v</sup>–198<sup>r</sup>).

A prose translation of Peter of Eboli’s *De balneis puteolanis* known as the “Trattato dei Bagni,” inc. “Inter tucte le opere create.” The description of the final bath, Succellario, is in Latin, expl. “hac currantur aqua ante lavantur ibi. Deo gracias. Amen” (fols. 198<sup>r</sup>–204<sup>r</sup>).<sup>14</sup>

A southern-Italian translation of Petrarch’s *Itinerarium ad Terram Sanctam*, inc. “[R]alle [*sic*] volta le fine delle cose rispondeno,” expl. “pyu sancto per quisti spectaculi et questo e Tiniracio essente te duca” (fols. 204<sup>r</sup>–216<sup>r</sup>).<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> G.M. Monti, “Una nuova fonte di storia angioina: un’altra cronaca martiniana,” *ASP* n.s. 28 (1942), 75. Monti mentions the presence of this work in another manuscript (Vat. Lat. 4601, described below) but provides no description of it other than giving it this title.

<sup>14</sup> On this and related works treating the thermal baths of Campania, see Livio Petrucci, “Le fonti per la conoscenza della topografia delle terme Flegree dal XII al XV secolo,” *ASP* 97 (1979), 99–129.

<sup>15</sup> See Alfonso Paolella, ed., *Volgarizzamento*, for an edition of this “Neapolitan” translation, itself based on an earlier Tuscan translation. Several editions of the Latin text exist, including G. Lumbroso, ed., “L’*Itinerarium* del Petrarca,” in *Rendiconti della reale Accademia dei Lincei* 4 (1888), 390–403, which is Paolella’s edition of reference, and

An incomplete copy of the *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum* of the late ninth and early tenth century, with the title “Incipit brevis compilatio episcoporum et archiepiscoporum civitatis Neapolis et intitulatur prelationis titulus Pauli Diaconi,” inc. “Primus Aspren episcopus sedit annos xxiii, hic fuit amator pauperum.” It ends in the reign of bishop Tiberius, corresponding to page 430 of Georg Waitz’s edition of this work, expl. “in manus eorumdem dolosum tradidit quo capto illico interlinatis duarum” (216<sup>v</sup>–223<sup>v</sup>).<sup>16</sup>

Fol. 224 is blank but numbered by the same hand that numbered the rest of the manuscript. A last folio, also blank, appears to be of newer paper and is numbered 225 in a modern hand. A note in the bottom margin of the first folio reads, “Francesco e Antonio de Buonanno fratelli hanno letto tutta questa historia,” which may indicate their ownership of the manuscript in the sixteenth century. The manuscript next appears in the historical record at auction in 1869, and was acquired by the Morgan Library in 1976.<sup>17</sup>

F = Florence, Biblioteca nazionale, fondo Gino Capponi 108.

c. 1440s. Paper, 2 + 94 fols., 2 columns. Alfonso Paoella has established the dating based on the watermark, similar to Briquet 8936, which comes either from Venice between 1443 and 1449, or from Fabriano in 1448. Paoella has also noted orthographical peculiarities suggesting a provenance in the Abruzzi, and a comment written by a later hand in the bottom margin of the last surviving folio (94<sup>v</sup>), which mentions the appointment in 1504 of one Vincenzo da Sessa (a possible owner) as vicar of the Congregation of the Holy Land.<sup>18</sup> The following catalog of manuscript contents is based on my perusal of the codex. The first two, unnumbered folios appear to have been bound into the manuscript at a later moment.

---

Francesco Lo Monaco, ed., *Itinerario in Terra Santa* (Bergamo, 1990), with facing-page Italian translation. A recent English translation (with facing-page facsimile edition) is Theodore Cahney, trans., *Petrarch's Guide to the Holy Land* (Notre Dame, IN, 2002).

<sup>16</sup> G. Waitz, ed., *Gesta episcoporum Neapolitanorum*, in *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI–IX* (Hannover, 1878), 396–439.

<sup>17</sup> See the online catalog description signalled in n. 11 above.

<sup>18</sup> Paoella, ed., *Volgarizzamento*, xliii, lxvii–lxix, xxix–xxx. Paoella reads the phrase “... fo facto vicario g. m. Vincenzo da Sessa” as “was made Vicar and Grand Master Vincenzo da Sessa,” although it might also be interpreted as “was made Vicar General Mister Vincenzo da Sessa.” No information on the manuscript’s owners is known until it entered, at an unstated time, the collection of Gino Capponi, who bequeathed it to the Biblioteca nazionale of Florence.



The first (I<sup>r</sup>) contains a modern index of the contents, which continues on fol. II<sup>r</sup> (fol. I<sup>v</sup> being blank) with the statement “in tutto carte novantaquattro.” The first text is the *Cronaca* (fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–16<sup>r</sup>). This text ends with “Deo gratias. Amen;” the rest of the column is blank. The “Southernized Villani” follows on fols. 16<sup>r</sup>–63<sup>v</sup>, with the same incipit and explicit as M1. After a space of about six lines, in which a later hand has written “G. Villani Lib. I, cap. II,” comes the “Universal Villani Excerpt” (fols. 63<sup>v</sup>–80<sup>r</sup>). It has the same incipit as M1, but its explicit, “erano tucti de la parte de lo re de Francia,” lacks the last four words found in M1. Though this text lacks a final punctus or other sign of completing a text, the rest of fol. 80<sup>r</sup> (most of column a and all of column b) is blank. The “Sito et conditione de Campania” follows on fols. 80<sup>v</sup>–83<sup>r</sup>, with the same incipit as M1 but a slightly different explicit, “et lo papa stava ad Roma mal securo et quasi assediato.” The rest of fol. 83<sup>r</sup> is blank. Next is the list of kings of ancient Israel (fols. 83<sup>v</sup>–84<sup>v</sup>), with the same incipit and explicit as M1. The two poems found in M1, with the same incipits and explicits, occupy fols. 85<sup>r</sup>–86<sup>r</sup>. Next comes the “Trattato dei bagni” on fols. 86<sup>r</sup>–88<sup>v</sup>, ending with the same Latin description of Succellario found in M1. The southern-Italian translation of Petrarch’s *Itinerarium* occupies fols. 89<sup>r</sup>–94<sup>v</sup>. The *Itinerarium* is incomplete, ending on the last line of fol. 94<sup>v</sup> with the words “da li arabi [*sic*] de re Herodes,” thus lacking the last two and a half chapters of the *Itinerarium* according to Alfonso Paoletta’s division of the text. Given the presence of the comment regarding 1504 in the bottom margin of this last folio, the manuscript was very likely already mutilated by that time.

V = Vatican City, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vat. lat. 4601

Second half of 15th c.<sup>19</sup> Parchment, 159 fols., two columns. The likely provenance is southern Lazio.<sup>20</sup> The *Cronaca* is the first text, occupying fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–22<sup>v</sup>. Its final chapters are greatly truncated and rearranged, and

<sup>19</sup> G.M. Monti discovered this copy. He gave the wrong shelf number (4061) for the manuscript, but his description of colored initials and awareness of some of the manuscript’s idiosyncrasies indicate good knowledge of it: see “La ‘Cronaca,’” 37. Monti dated it to the mid-fifteenth century, Francesco Sabatini (*Napoli angioina*, 140) more broadly to the second half of the fifteenth century. Fabio Troncarelli and Roberto Pesce confirm a dating to this half-century; the closing of the Vatican Library prevented analysis of watermarks for a more precision. Altamura’s dating to the late fourteenth century (*La Cronaca*, 13–14) should be discounted.

<sup>20</sup> A single hand copied the entire manuscript, and one of the later texts included in it suggested to Francesco Sabatini a provenance in this region: see below at note 22.

it ends midsentence with material found in chapter 73A.<sup>21</sup> The following two folios, which belong to the same fascicle, are blank. The next text is the “Universal Villani Excerpt” in 59 chapters, with the same incipit and explicit as M1 (fols. 25<sup>r</sup>–53<sup>r</sup>). Subsequent texts are out of order. The “Sito et conditione de Campania” occupies fols. 53<sup>r</sup>–54<sup>v</sup> and 73<sup>r</sup>–75<sup>v</sup>. The list of the kings of ancient Israel and other peoples follows on fols. 75<sup>v</sup>–78<sup>r</sup>, bearing the same incipit and explicit (with minor variants) as M1. “Versus quatuor virtutum scripti in curia consulum Romanorum,” in the vernacular but with headings in Latin, occupies 78<sup>r</sup>. Vernacular verses continue on 78<sup>v</sup> but appear to be a different text, treating Theseus, Jason, and other ancient Greek figures; this text continues and ends on fol. 82<sup>r</sup>. An acephalous text on the ancient, Byzantine, and western Roman emperors and popes occupies fols. 55<sup>r</sup>–72<sup>v</sup>, while fols. 79<sup>r</sup>–81<sup>v</sup> and 82<sup>v</sup>–159<sup>v</sup> are misplaced parts or extensions the same work. G.M. Monti has identified it as a translation of Martin of Troppau’s *Chronica pontificum et imperatorum*, including an original continuation treating the popes from Nicholas IV to Benedict XII that shows particular interest in the Angevin dynasty.<sup>22</sup> This text, clearly incomplete, ends midsentence on the fourth line of fol. 159<sup>v</sup> in the pontificate of Benedict XII, expl. “Iu dicto papa Benedictu ordenao speciale thesauru le laude et tucte le torsioni le quali se faceano contra ragione et era. Finis. Laus Deo.” The seal of the Bibliothèque nationale appears on this last folio alongside that of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.

N1 = Naples, Biblioteca nazionale, XIV D 7

1471. Paper, 6 + 146 folios, two columns. Copied in the environs of Salerno. This manuscript bears the *siglum* N2 in earlier scholarship on the *Cronaca*. The first six, unnumbered folios bear the title “Cronica

<sup>21</sup> For a more complete description of the idiosyncrasies of this copy, see below in the paragraph following note 96.

<sup>22</sup> Monti, “Una nuova fonte di storia angioina,” 75–98. Because the author of this text both translates Martin of Troppau’s work with a certain freedom and pro-Angevin cast, and adds an original continuation, Monti has characterized it as an original composition in the “Martinian” tradition rather than a faithful translation of the Martin’s work. He believed it to date to the fourteenth century, and noted the author’s “wide knowledge of events of the kingdom of Naples,” especially for the reign of King Robert (1309–1343). Francesco Sabatini judged the author to be from southern Lazio. This judgment is based on the author’s precise knowledge of that region but also on the orthographical peculiarities of the work: if so, then the fifteenth-century copyist, as well as the fourteenth-century author, must have hailed from this region. See Sabatini, *Napoli angioina*, 140.

de la Inclita Citta di Napole di Messer Ioanne Villano” (fol. I) and a table of contents (fols. II–VI), all in a later hand. The *Cronaca* is the first text (fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–20<sup>v</sup>). It is followed by the “Southernized Villani” (20<sup>v</sup>–97<sup>r</sup>) with the same incipit and explicit as M1, but adding a title: “Questa storia tracta de lo nassimento de Mahomecto et delle soi condicciuni et predicaciuni et ligi che fece contra la fede christiana lo quale fece multe cactive operaciuni contra ala ecclesia de Dio.” Next is the “Universal Villani Excerpt” (97<sup>r</sup>–123<sup>r</sup>), which follows the “Southernized Villani” as if the same text, with no graphic break. The “Universal Villani Excerpt” begins like other copies, “Noi [*sic*] troviamo per lle storie ...,” but ends with the explicit “poi lo dicto re calvacco nelle terre de lo conte de Varri dove fece grandissimo danno,” thus omitting the last two words of 58th chapter and all of the 59th. Next comes the “Sito et conditione de Campania,” with a different title than but same incipit and explicit as M1 (123<sup>r</sup>–127<sup>v</sup>).<sup>23</sup> It is followed by the tract on the kings of ancient Israel and other peoples (127<sup>v</sup>–130<sup>r</sup>); the two poems also found in M1 (130<sup>r</sup>–131<sup>v</sup>); the “Trattato dei Bagni” including the Latin epigram on Succellario found in M1 (132<sup>r</sup>–136<sup>v</sup>); and the southern-Italian translation of Petrarch’s *Itinerarium ad Terram Sanctam* (136<sup>v</sup>–146<sup>v</sup>). All contents are copied in a single hand. Titles of works and of individual chapters as well as chapter initials are rubricated. Consecutive chapter numeration was added by a later hand, often extending far into the margin, to the texts of the *Cronaca* and the “Southernized Villani” only, such that the first chapter of the “Southernized Villani” is marked as chapter 72. A colophon at the bottom of 146<sup>v</sup> identifies the date and copyist: “Presens liber scriptus et finitus est per manum notarii Petri de Aliberto de baronia Sancti Severini sub anno domini M<sup>o</sup> CCCC<sup>o</sup> septuagesimo primo die xxiiii agosto iiii<sup>o</sup> ind. ad preces et rogatum magnifici viri domini Alexandri Maccie de Salerno militis in dicto anno dignissimi viceprincipis dicte baronie.” Pietro de Aliberto belonged to a family of Salernitan notaries; Alessandro Mazza, viceprince of the barony, may have commissioned this manuscript in emulation of his powerful and humanist-educated lord, Roberto Sanseverino, prince of Salerno.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> The best physical description of this manuscript is Paoella, ed., *Volgarizzamento*, xxxviii–xl, who however conflates these first four texts.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, xxvii–xxviii.

P2 = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, italien 301

1479. Paper, 161 fols., two columns. The *Cronaca* is the first text (1<sup>r</sup>–24<sup>v</sup>). Roughly a third of a column is left blank between the *Cronaca* and the following text, the “Southernized Villani” (24<sup>v</sup>–118<sup>v</sup>). The latter is divided into 170 rather than 168 chapters but bears the same incipit and explicit as M1. The “Universal Villani Excerpt” (119<sup>r</sup>–150<sup>r</sup>) starts at the top of a new folio, but with no graphic break from the “Southernized Villani,” which ended on the last line of the previous verso. It has the same incipit and explicit as M1 (less the M1 explicit’s last unfinished phrase, “unde lo dicto re”) and the same division into 59 chapters. It moves immediately into the “Sito et conditione de Campania” (150<sup>r</sup>–154<sup>v</sup>), which bears a slightly altered explicit (“ad Roma male securo et quasi assediato”), then to the text on the kings of ancient Israel and other peoples (154<sup>v</sup>–156<sup>v</sup>) with the same incipit and explicit as M1, and again with no break into the “Trattato dei Bagni” (156<sup>v</sup>–161<sup>v</sup>), with the usual incipit but ending “ma ene una gropta la quale tene dentro acqua saluifera.” (P2 thus lacks the final Latin epigram found in M1 and N1). After a “finis. Deo gratias. Amen,” the last half of this last column features a colophon in a slightly more formal script: “Liber iste inceptus fuit die xv Januarii per me Berardinum de Turricella de cap[itul]o tunc temporis cancellarium M[agnifi]ci d[omi]ni d[omi]ni Thomasii de Chiavellis de Fabriano; expletus vero die xviii martii currente milleno CCCC lxxviii in villa brende comitatus Senarum: scriptus que fuit sub nomine strenui regii armorum ductoris d[omi]ni Mathei de Montecello domini mei observandissimi. Fine facto, pia laudetur virgo Maria. Amen.” Throughout, chapter initials are missing, and there are no chapter titles. Like P1, this manuscript passed to the library of the Aragonese kings of Naples sometime after 1442 and in 1495, via Charles VIII, to the library of the kings of France, whose seal is found on this last folio and in the first, blank lines of fol. 1<sup>ra</sup>.<sup>25</sup> I have not been able to identify the “comitatus Senarum” of the colophon. No information on provenance is offered by earlier scholars or catalog descriptions, and the several watermarks found in the manuscript do not aid in identifying its place of copying.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> On the Aragonese possession, see Mazzatinti, *La biblioteca dei Re d'Aragona*, 108. The catalog of the Bibliothèque nationale offers no more information than that found in Mazzatinti. General descriptions of the manuscript are in Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 39; Altamura, ed., *La Cronaca*, 15–16; and de Marinis, *Biblioteca napoletana*, vol. 2, 56.

<sup>26</sup> The online catalog of the Bibliothèque nationale de France states only that the manuscript is fifteenth-century, contains 161 folios, and was brought by Charles VIII to

E = Modena, Biblioteca Estense, It. 281 (= alpha. H. 8. 14, formerly VIII B 4)

c. 1480s. Parchment, 63 fols., single column. Mazzatinti surmised that this is the copy of the “Cronache di Napoli” mentioned in several Aragonese documents as having been copied in 1487 by Giovan Rinaldo Mennio and illuminated by Cristoforo Maiorana for Alfonso, duke of Calabria. De Marinis concurs that the manuscript was Aragonese, but does not believe the scribal hand to be Mennio’s.<sup>27</sup> The manuscript must have passed into d’Este hands before the Aragonese library was despoiled by Charles VIII of France in 1495. Relations between the d’Este and the Aragonese were very close in the later fifteenth century. Ercole d’Este had been educated at the Aragonese court in Naples, was married in 1473 to the sister of Alfonso, duke of Calabria (who ruled as Alfonso II from January 1494 to January 1495), and gave Alfonso command of d’Este military forces in the 1480s. If this manuscript was not that copied by Mennio for Alfonso in 1487, it does seem to have been a gift from the Aragonese to their d’Este in-law, given sometime before 1495.<sup>28</sup> The *Cronaca* is the only text, and is incomplete: at least one folio at the end of the manuscript is missing. Folios are unnumbered, and the text of the *Cronaca* bears neither chapter titles nor chapter numbers. Seven non-consecutive chapters of this copy were published by Antonio Cappelli in 1861, as a point of comparison with a different text (an account of the Sicilian Vespers) that Cappelli had identified in a different Modenese

---

France, citing Mazzatini, *La biblioteca* (see previous note). In fact, like P1, this manuscript was also described by A. Marsand, *I manoscritti*, at vol. 1, n. 376. He was unable to identify any contents, and (like de Marinis, *loc. cit.*) treated all the works in the manuscript as a single text, offering the incipit of the *Cronaca* and the explicit of the “Trattato,” as well as the colophon. P2’s watermarks, similar to Briquet 5904, 10773, and 3371, all date to the later fifteenth century but are widely dispersed geographically (Venice, Florence, Fabriano, Naples, Palermo, Rome).

<sup>27</sup> Mazzatinti, *La biblioteca*, 175–176. De Marinis, *Biblioteca napoletana*, vol. 2, 56–57. E’s decoration is similar to that of other Aragonese manuscripts, including the placement of a coat of arms (erased in E, but Aragonese in other manuscripts) at the center of the bottom margin of the first folio. Compare the first folio of E (de Marinis, vol. 3, table 79) with those shown in vol. 4, tables 164 and 173, among others.

<sup>28</sup> See Werner Gundersheimer, *Ferrara: The Style of a Renaissance Despotism* (Princeton, 1973), 176–177 on Ercole’s education in Naples and 218 on his general political alliance with the Aragonese. Thomas Touhy notes that Alfonso, duke of Calabria, took over military command of forces in Ferrara in the early 1480s when Ercole fell ill, and resided at the d’Este court: see *Herculean Ferrara. Ercole d’Este, 1471–1505, and the Invention of a Ducal Capital* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), 80, 220–221.

codex. Cappelli's brief description adds no information regarding the codex, and only rehearses the state of knowledge of the *Cronaca* as it was in the mid-nineteenth century.<sup>29</sup>

SN<sub>1</sub> = Naples, Società napoletana di storia patria, XX C 5

1497–1504. Paper, 3 + 211 + 1 fols., single column. Dating is based on the fact that the principal hand added information at the end of the “Southernized Villani” regarding events to 1497, while a later hand added a further ten lines regarding immediately subsequent events, including the death of Frederick I of Aragon in November 1504.<sup>30</sup> The watermark is similar to Briquet 13884 (Rome, 1501), but José Alcina Franch has noted that the same type was often used in Naples between 1504 and 1509.<sup>31</sup> After a blank folio of slightly inferior paper are two unnumbered title pages (I and II). The first (I) records the presence of three texts in the manuscript, in a modern hand.<sup>32</sup> The second (II) bears titles by two hands. The first hand, certainly post-1526 and probably sixteenth-century, wrote, “Chronica originale di Giovanni Villano molto piu copiosa della stampata in Napoli nell’anno 1526.” The second, much later hand added below, “nella quale apparisce al foglio 31 che la giunta sia state fatta da Bartolomeo Caracciolo detto Carrafa sul regnare di Giovanna prima e di Luigi d’Angio suo marito.”

The *Cronaca* is the first text (fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–31<sup>r</sup>). It moves directly into the “Southernized Villani” (31<sup>r</sup>–151<sup>r</sup>), which has the same incipit and explicit as M<sub>1</sub>. As noted above, fols. 151<sup>r</sup>–153<sup>v</sup> very briefly recount the deeds

<sup>29</sup> Antonio Cappelli, “Giovanni da Procida e il Vespro siciliano,” in *Miscellanea di opuscoli inediti o rari dei secoli XIV e XV*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1861), vol. 1. The chapters of the *Cronaca* he offers in an appendix (pp. 77–97) correspond to chapters 65B, 76–78B, and 88–90B of the present edition. His description of the *Cronaca*, on pp. 34–37, rehearses the debate over the authorship of one Giovanni Rumbo detto Villano or Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa and inaccurately describes the text as ending in the year 1300; he offers no information on provenance, dating, or physical characteristics of the codex itself.

<sup>30</sup> Monti first noted these additions (“La ‘Cronaca,’” 40) but identified the principal hand as recording events to 1494. As that hand also mentioned the succession of Frederick (IV) in 1496 and his coronation (which occurred in 1497, as the later hand noted), we must push its *terminus post quem* forward a few years. Livio Petrucci, following a scholarly tradition regarding the “Trattato” also found in this manuscript, dates the manuscript to the beginning of the sixteenth century: “Le fonti per la conoscenza,” 112.

<sup>31</sup> José Alcina Franch, *La Biblioteca de Alfonso V de Aragón en Nápoles*, 2 vols. (Valencia, 2000), vol. 1, 98 and figure 6b.

<sup>32</sup> “In questo volume si contengono: La Cronica di Gio. Villani il Napoletano dal foglio primo al 153; Cronica universale di autore anonimo dal foglio 154 al 190; Trattato de’ Bagni di Pozzuolo et Ischia, fol. 191 al 211.”

and succession of rulers from the reign of King Robert to 1497, after which a different hand added a few lines regarding the early sixteenth century. Fol. 154, the last folio of this fascicle, has been cut out of the manuscript. Fol. 155 is a new title page reading “Cronica universale di autore anonimo” on its recto; the verso is blank. The text signalled by this title is the “Universal Villani Excerpt” (155<sup>r</sup>–177<sup>r</sup>, 181<sup>v</sup>–190<sup>v</sup>). The first segment includes the first 38 chapters of this work, while the second picks up with chapter 39 and continues to chapter 59, but with the different explicit, “et poy andao ad guantes dondo lo ditto re non potte far niente.”<sup>33</sup> Between these two segments appears the “Sito et conditione de Campania” (177<sup>r</sup>–181<sup>v</sup>), with the usual incipit but a different explicit (it lacks the last few lines). Fol. 191<sup>r</sup> is another title page. The same hand that wrote the first title on fol. II here wrote, “Trattato de’ Bagni di Pozzuolo et Ischia impresso gia in Napoli nel 1526 appresso la Cronica di Giovanni Villani ma con diversita da questo suo originale.” The text of the “Trattato” follows (191<sup>v</sup>–211<sup>r</sup>). It is notable for including what Livio Petrucci has called “eight spurious epigrams” in Latin and for its large illustrations, which usually occupy half the page.<sup>34</sup> Fol. 211<sup>v</sup> is blank, and followed by a guard folio of inferior paper like that at the start of the manuscript.

Marginalia and other interventions were made to the manuscript by four hands. One, which added marginal chapter summaries in a small script, may be the same hand that copied the text. A second, of the same era as the principal hand, added chapter titles in the interstices between chapters and some marginalia. The third, which added Roman numeral chapter numbers in the margins, is very likely the same late-sixteenth-century hand that copied the first title on fol. II. The fourth is a late-sixteenth-century cursive, different however from that which copied the additional title on fol. II.<sup>35</sup>

The manuscript belonged to Francesco Antonio Casella in the late nineteenth century, when Bartolomeo Capasso first identified it.<sup>36</sup> No other information on its provenance is available.

---

<sup>33</sup> Compared to the copy in M1, this copy leaves out a phrase in the final sentence (between “quanto” and “dondo”) and adds “non potte far niente,” doubtless the final words missing from M1.

<sup>34</sup> Livio Petrucci, “Le fonti per la conoscenza della topografia delle terme Flegree dal XII al XV secolo,” *ASPN* 97 (1979), 112–114.

<sup>35</sup> My thanks again to Fabio Troncarelli for his observations in these hands.

<sup>36</sup> Capasso, “Le fonti,” 592n, where it is listed as manuscript number 5.

GC = Naples, Archivio di Stato, fondo Giudice Caracciolo di Cellamare, 38

1516. Paper, 4 + 197 fols., single column. The manuscript has previously been dated to the early sixteenth century based on the hand. Greater precision is possible thanks to a letter copied on one of the last folios and dated 6 February 1516; the hand is the same as that which copied all previous contents. The very last folio is copied in a different hand—possibly the one that made corrections to the text of the *Cronaca*. It lists the rumors and public announcements made in Naples between February 13 and February 20, 1516, regarding the death of king “Ferrante,”<sup>37</sup> and its final entry begins, “In quisto di vinti de Febraro,” suggesting this was the date of writing. Previous texts in the manuscript were also copied in Naples, as indicated by a comment added at the end of the introduction to the *Cronaca* (fol. 1<sup>r</sup>), “et li presente sono copiate et scripte ad instantia de notaro Antonio Gambardella de Napoli et ad sua complacentia desideruso de legere et intendere.” The first, unnumbered folio (I) contains later comments in two hands. The first is a transcription of five lines found, it says, on a piece of wood; the second is a scrawled summary of the manuscript’s contents, followed by the Latin distych found in the *Cronaca* chapter 19 (20B). The *Cronaca* is the first text (1<sup>r</sup>–36<sup>f</sup>). The “Southernized Villani” follows on fols. 36<sup>r</sup>–115<sup>v</sup>, with the same incipit and explicit as M1 but missing a number of chapters. Fols. 115<sup>v</sup>–163<sup>v</sup> are mostly occupied by chapters of the “Universal Villani Excerpt” but they are badly out of order and interspersed with a few of the missing chapters from the “Southernized Villani.”<sup>38</sup> There follows the first of the two poems found in M1, that is, the verse lament of the Church, with the same title and incipit as M1 (163<sup>v</sup>–166<sup>r</sup>). Next comes the “Trattato dei Bagni” (166<sup>r</sup>–173<sup>v</sup>), inc. “Intra tocte le opere creature [*sic*],” which includes the final Latin epigram on Succellario found in M1 and N1. It is followed by the southern-Italian translation of Petrarch’s *Itinerarium*, inc. “Rade volte li fini dele cose respondeno,” expl. “et per questo specta quali e questo e generacio et essentetus duca amenus amen amen” (173<sup>v</sup>–185<sup>v</sup>). The rest

<sup>37</sup> That is, Ferdinand “the Catholic,” king of Aragon, who gained the title to the kingdom of Naples in 1504.

<sup>38</sup> After the final chapter of the “Southernized Villani” (SV) on fol. 115<sup>v</sup>, the chapters are as follows: SV 64; UV 40, 15–18, 39, 1–14 (where chapter 3 is divided into two), 27, 19–26, 28–38, 40 (again), 41–44, 47–49, 52, 56–59; SV 60; UV 53–54; SV 44, 48, 58, 62. The “SV” chapters found here are among those lacking from fols. 36<sup>r</sup>–115<sup>v</sup>, but do not account for all those missing chapters.



of this gathering (185bis, ter, and quatuor) is blank. The final gathering includes fols. 186–197, mostly copied by the same hand as the rest of the manuscript. Folio 186<sup>r</sup> contains a letter of Charles Habsburg, the future emperor Charles V, to his “Neapolitan subjects,” dated 6 February 1516, inc. “Carolus hispanie princeps, archidux austriae ... Eximii et circumspiciti viri subditi,” expl. “ex urisciella vi februarii 1516 yo el principe R. arduentia.” Beneath this is written, “A TERGO: Eximiis et circumspicitis gubernatoribus senatoribus et maistratibus reipublice civitatis nostre neapu[li].” Folio 186<sup>v</sup> is blank. Folio 187<sup>r-v</sup> gives the succession of Sicilian kings from Roger II to the year 1503, inc. “Lo primo re intitulado de Sicilia fo re Rogeri,” expl. “Et in lo anno 1503 ... Ferrando locumtenente del cactolico re de Spagnia trasio in Napoli havendo ructo lo duca de Nemurs con lo exercito in la Cirignola.” The remaining folios, 188–197, are blank except for 197<sup>v</sup>, on which a different hand—perhaps the same that made corrections to the text of the *Cronaca di Partenope*—listed facts of 1516 regarding Ferdinand of Aragon and the duke of Anjou in half-lines.<sup>39</sup>

SN2 = Naples, Società napoletana di storia patria, XXXII D 14 bis

Circa 1568. Paper, 1 + 266 + 14 fols., single column. The hand has been dated to the sixteenth century generally or to the late sixteenth century. Further precision is provided by the watermark, virtually identical to Briquet 5377 (Naples, 1568), which also indicates a likely Neapolitan origin.<sup>40</sup> The first folio (I), of inferior paper, bears the title “Cronica di Partenope (con aggiunte)” in a modern hand. The *Cronaca* is the first text (fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–34<sup>v</sup>), of which only the first 19 folios are numbered. Chapter titles and numbering are consistent and in the same hand as the

<sup>39</sup> A detailed physical description of the manuscript is provided by Paoella, ed., *Volgarizzamento*, xl–xlii, which however includes a few errors regarding its contents. Paoella locates the copyist’s self-identification on the guard leaf (I) as part of the title found there, and omits notice of the distych that is found on the guard leaf; he also incorrectly expands the abbreviation “cav<sup>o</sup>” found in this title as “canonico,” whereas it should read “cavaliero”—it is a reference to the *Cronaca* colophon, identifying Bartolomeo Caracciolo detto Carafa as “cavaliero napoletano.” Only the first of the two poems found in M1 is also found here, whereas Paoella claims it possesses both. He indicates that at least two copyists worked on the manuscript, but does not identify which folios belong to which; only the final folio, in my estimation, belongs to a different hand than the rest. Like all earlier scholars of the *Cronaca* (but unlike his own descriptions of other manuscripts he describes), he here treats the *Cronaca*, the “SV,” and the “UV” as a single work.

<sup>40</sup> Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 40; Altamura, ed., *La Cronaca*, 20. Neither examined the watermark.

text. The *Cronaca* is followed by the “Southernized Villani” (fols. 34<sup>v</sup>–200<sup>r</sup>) with the usual incipit and explicit, but with consecutive chapter numeration, such that (as in N<sub>1</sub>) the first chapter of the “SV” is numbered 72.<sup>41</sup> The “Universal Villani Excerpt” is next (fols. 200<sup>r</sup>–258<sup>r</sup>), again with consecutive chapter numeration (here, 242–299), ending with the 58th chapter, expl. “lo ditto re cavalco nele terre del conte de Barri, dove fece grandissimo danno.” The last text, which escaped the notice of previous scholars, is the “Sito et conditione de Campania” (fols. 258<sup>r</sup>–266<sup>r</sup>), also with consecutive chapter numeration (here, 300–303), and with the usual incipit and explicit. Fol. 266<sup>v</sup> is blank, as are the remaining 13 folios and a guard leaf of inferior paper like that at the beginning of the manuscript. Monti noted that it had once belonged to Francesco Carafa, Duke of Forlì and Count of Policastro, whose “ex libris” indeed appears on the front cover. It belonged in the nineteenth century to the scholar Gennaro Aspreno Galante, who gave it to Bartolomeo Capasso. Capasso, whose own “ex libris” appears on the inside cover, gave it to the Società napoletana di storia patria where it now resides.<sup>42</sup>

P<sub>3</sub> = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, italien 303

Circa 1600. Paper, 1 + 246 fols., single column. A partially obscured watermark is similar to Briquet 61 (Naples, 1584), but perhaps closer to a variant of 1604. Either variant suggests a Neapolitan origin.<sup>43</sup> After a blank, unnumbered first folio (I) the *Cronaca* is the first text (fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–45<sup>r</sup>), with chapter titles and faulty chapter numeration.<sup>44</sup> It segues directly into the “Southernized Villani” (fols. 45<sup>r</sup>–201<sup>r</sup>), bearing the usual incipit and explicit, with consecutive chapter numeration such that the first chapter of this text (as in N<sub>1</sub> and SN<sub>2</sub>) is numbered 72. Folio 151<sup>r-v</sup>, in the middle of this work, is blank. The “Southernized Villani” flows

---

<sup>41</sup> If its chapter numeration is correct, the “SV” here contains 169 rather than 168 chapters, as the last is numbered 241.

<sup>42</sup> Its various owners are identified by Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 40.

<sup>43</sup> Very brief descriptions dating the manuscript to the seventeenth century are found in Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 40, and Altamura, ed., *La Cronaca*, 16. I thank Fabio Troncarelli for examining the hand and suggesting a date circa 1600. The 1584 watermark in Briquet is topped by three letters, the variant of 1604 by two; as these are obscured in P<sub>3</sub>, either variant is possible. Other watermarks in P<sub>3</sub> are not found in Briquet’s catalog, which concludes its survey of watermarks in 1600; this further suggests an early-seventeenth-century date of copying.

<sup>44</sup> This copy does not number the first chapter, identifying chapter 2 as chapter 1; after its chapter 12 it begins numbering again with 11, and after its chapter 23 it begins numbering again with 21.

directly and with consecutive chapter numeration into the “Universal Villani Excerpt” (fols. 210<sup>r</sup>–240<sup>v</sup>), which bears the same explicit as N1 and SN2 and thus lacks a little more than a chapter compared to M1. Consecutive chapter numeration continues into the “Sito et conditione de Campania” (fols. 240<sup>v</sup>–246<sup>r</sup>), with the usual incipit and explicit, except that its final word is “trattati” instead of “tartari.” The text ends on the third line of 246<sup>r</sup> with a “finis.” Fol. 246<sup>v</sup> is blank. The existence of this copy was first noted by Mazzatinti in a very brief reference.<sup>45</sup> It appears to have been very little studied and no information on its provenance is offered by previous scholars of the *Cronaca*.<sup>46</sup>

The two additional manuscripts no longer available for consultation are:

N2 = Naples, Biblioteca nazionale, fondo San Martino I 63

1451. Paper, 150 fols., two columns. Copied in the Abruzzi. This manuscript, bearing the *siglum* N1 in previous scholarship on the *Cronaca*, is no longer available for consultation or microfilming due to its extremely poor condition. G.M. Monti studied it in the 1930s and included it in his chart of the contents of known manuscripts of the *Cronaca*. According to that chart, it contained only six chapters from the middle of our work, corresponding to chapters 51–56 of the present edition.<sup>47</sup> Following the *Cronaca* are the “Southernized Villani” lacking early chapters (those remaining are numbered 77–240) and the “Universal Villani Excerpt” in numbered chapters 241–297. The recent manuscript description offered by Alfonso Paoletta indicates that the *Cronaca*, “SV,” and “UV” together occupy folios 1<sup>r</sup>–110<sup>v</sup>, of which fols. 5<sup>v</sup>–19<sup>v</sup> are blank.<sup>48</sup> Next comes the

---

<sup>45</sup> Giuseppe Mazzatinti, *Inventario dei manoscritti italiani delle biblioteche di Francia* (Rome, 1886–1888), vol. 1, 67.

<sup>46</sup> The online catalog of the Bibliothèque nationale de France states only that the manuscript of seventeenth-century and is “another copy of italien 304,” i.e. manuscript P1. It offers a reference to A. Marsand, *I manoscritti*, vol. 1, n. 378, who here, as in previous entries (see the notes to manuscripts P1 and P2 above), offers a very vague and inaccurate description of contents and no information on provenance, other than noting that the language it uses is “closer to the Neapolitan dialect than to our Italian language.”

<sup>47</sup> This manuscript numbered them 47–52. Altamura, who consulted this manuscript, said that chapter 47 corresponded to his chapter 53, which in the current edition represents chapter 51. See Altamura, ed., *La Cronaca*, 16–18.

<sup>48</sup> Monti provides this information about the incomplete contents of the *Cronaca* and “SV.” Paoletta’s description of contents suggest that these three works occupy fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–110<sup>v</sup>, which he describes as containing the “Croniche de la inclita cita de Napole emendatissime con li Bagni.” This is the title of the 1526 edition, which was added by a later hand, as

“Sito et conditione de Campania” (fols. 111<sup>r</sup>–114<sup>r</sup>), followed by the list of kings of ancient Israel (fols. 114<sup>v</sup>–116<sup>r</sup>).<sup>49</sup> Fol. 116<sup>r</sup> contains only the last verses of the poem inc. “Pieta pieta,” followed by the second poem found in M1. Next is the “Trattato dei Bagni” (fols. 116<sup>r</sup>–119<sup>v</sup>)<sup>50</sup> and the southern-Italian translation of Petrarch’s *Itinerarium* (fols. 119<sup>v</sup>–128<sup>r</sup>). An explicit after this last work reads, “Deo gratias. Amen. Finito libro isto redamus gloria Christo. Istum librum scripsit Vinciguerra de Podio de Marsico sub anno domini MCCCCLI jnd. XIII.” Alfonso Paoella has observed that Vinciguerra was almost certainly not from Marsico in Basilicata, but rather from la Marsica in the Abruzzi, a region whose linguistic peculiarities are manifest in this copy.<sup>51</sup> The last three works were copied by a different hand. They are: vernacular translations of two works of Cicero, the *Lelius* (fols. 130<sup>r</sup>–143<sup>v</sup>) and the *Cato maior vel de senectute* (fols. 143<sup>v</sup>–155<sup>r</sup>), and a vernacular translation of Aristotle’s *Ethics*, Book II (fols. 156<sup>r</sup>–175<sup>r</sup>). Monti stated that these last three texts occupy a different fascicle, which he believed to have been inserted into the manuscript at a later date. Paoella, however, observes that the watermarks of the folios from 130 forward correspond to those of earlier gatherings.<sup>52</sup>

VZ = A manuscript once belonging to Giuliano Vanzolini of Pesaro

1471. This manuscript was signalled by Bartolomeo Capasso in 1902, but appears to have been already lost. G.M. Monti attempted to locate it in the 1930s with no success.<sup>53</sup> It can be approached now only through the

---

Monti noted. See G.M. Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 37–38, and Paoella, ed., *Volgarizzamento*, xxxiv–xxxvii.

<sup>49</sup> Both Monti and Paoella note the presence of the “Sito;” Monti does not indicate the presence of the list of kings of ancient Israel.

<sup>50</sup> The foliation of this work is provided by Paoella, ed. cit., xxxvii, and its identity as the “Trattato” is confirmed by Livio Petrucci’s comments on that work: see his “Le fonti per la conoscenza,” 112.

<sup>51</sup> Paoella, ed. cit., xxvii, lxxvii–lxxix.

<sup>52</sup> The description of watermarks, however, is confused: Paoella states (p. xxxvi) that fols. 1–19 and 160–175 bear one watermark (an episcopal stemma with acanthus leaves), but then states that fols. 20–78 and 80–175 bear a different watermark (and “R” with a cross above, = Briquet 8936). By this description, both watermarks would appear on fols. 160–175. Perhaps we should understand the Briquet watermark to end at fol. 159. However that may be, it appears that early and late folios bear common watermarks, suggesting the fascicle from 130 ff. (if it was a new fascicle, as Monti stated) was not bound in at a later moment.

<sup>53</sup> Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 39.

comments of and four-chapter transcription done by Vincenzo di Giovanni in the later nineteenth century.<sup>54</sup> Di Giovanni indicated that the manuscript was paper, and bore a colophon giving its copyist and date of completion (“Quisto fo fenuto da me Thomas Cazapoto ali M CCCCLxxj die ultimo octobris ind. in die Jovis et in vigilia omnium sanctorum”). According to di Giovanni, this copy of the *Cronaca* ended with the names of the children of Charles II and did not proceed past 1300. Di Giovanni mentions no other contents in the manuscript; probably the *Cronaca* was the only text, as is the case for PL and E to which VZ, as far as these four published chapters attest, bears textual similarities.

Two more manuscripts noted in earlier scholarship are copies of early printed editions:

M<sub>2</sub> = New York, Morgan Library, M 801

1490–1500. Curt Bühler, curator of the Morgan Library, compared this copy with the *editio princeps* when the manuscript entered the Morgan collection and established definitively that it is a copy of that first edition, whose date (1486–1490) provides a firm *terminus post quem*. More recently, Rosario Coluccia has studied one of its later texts, the *Ferraiolo Cronaca*, and dated the manuscript to before 1500. The manuscript was copied by the author of that latter work, Melchiorre Ferraiolo, a servant of the Aragonese kings. He made a few original additions to the *Cronaca* and to other texts included in the codex.<sup>55</sup>

N<sub>3</sub> = Naples, Biblioteca nazionale, XIII AA 39

Late 16th c. G.M. Monti suggested that it is a copy of the 1526 edition, as did an earlier student of the manuscript, A. Miola. Antonio Altamura's proposal that it might be “the only surviving witness of a primitive family of manuscripts” that included the late-fourteenth-century continuation of the *Cronaca* (i. e. the “Later Angevin Chronicle”) is without basis.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Vincenzo di Giovanni, “Di un altro codice della ‘Cronaca di Napoli’ di Giovanni Villani,” *Propugnatore* 9 (1876), 174–187.

<sup>55</sup> Curt Bühler, “The Thirteenth Recorded Manuscript of the *Cronaca di Partenope*,” *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 67 (1952), 580–584; Rosario Coluccia, *Ferraiolo Cronaca* (Florence, 1987).

<sup>56</sup> Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 41, who observes that the manuscript bears the same title as the 1526 edition. The same opinion was reached by A. Miola in an article of 1888, as

Two more manuscripts were signalled by previous scholars as containing only “Part II” of the *Cronaca*. These manuscripts are:

SN<sub>3</sub> = Naples, Società napoletana di storia patria, XXVIII D 10

Mid-16th c. This manuscript is also known as “Fuscolillo” after its compiler, Gaspare Fuscolillo, a canon of Sessa. Fuscolillo’s original contributions principally regard events of the 1560s and he died in 1571, making the 1560s the likely period of compilation.<sup>57</sup> The contents relevant to the *Cronaca di Partenope* are a brief Latin history found on its first four folios, and the early folios of its third vernacular history, entitled “Cronaca del Regno di Napoli,” on fols. 67<sup>r</sup>–77<sup>r</sup>. Capasso judged the latter text to be a copy of the *Cronaca* “Part II.”<sup>58</sup>

N<sub>4</sub> = Naples, BN, MS X C 31

17th c. Folios 80<sup>v</sup>–87<sup>v</sup> contain a text bearing the title “Chronicon de Bartolomeo Carazzuolo.” The same hand copied an alternate ending to the work in the margin.<sup>59</sup>

As discussed at length in Chapter Five above, both these works are later adaptations of the *Cronaca* that borrow material found in early chapters (“Part I”) and later chapters (“Part II”). They therefore are not copies of the *Cronaca* nor evidence of the independent circulation or composition of “Part II.”

Finally, Bartolomeo Capasso made brief mention in a footnote of a miscellaneous manuscript of the seventeenth century in the former Imperial Library of Vienna (VI), which he identified as another witness to “Part II” alone and probably a copy of N<sub>4</sub>. He gave no shelf mark, and

---

Altamura observed. Altamura’s different hypothesis appears to be based on his confidence in the *Cronaca*’s first editor, who edited a manuscript containing the “Later Angevin Chronicle.” As noted in Chapter Five above, this confidence is misplaced. See Altamura, ed., *La Cronaca*, 19, 35–36.

<sup>57</sup> B. Capasso, “Le ‘Cronache de li antiqui Ri del Regno di Napoli’ di D. Gaspare Fuscollilo,” *ASP* 1 (1876), 35–43.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 37, and B. Capasso, “Le fonti,” 595n. Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” did not include SN<sub>3</sub> in his description of manuscripts but did include it in his chart of manuscript contents on 64–77.

<sup>59</sup> Capasso, “Le fonti,” 595n, Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 41, and Altamura, ed. *La Cronaca*, 19–20.

later scholars, though continuing to cite this manuscript, were not able to trace it.<sup>60</sup> Presuming that it was indeed related to N<sub>4</sub>, it is in any case not a manuscript copy of the *Cronaca* but of a later adaptation of it.

In addition to these manuscript copies, the *Cronaca* underwent three printed editions, all in Naples:

*editio princeps*

Though lacking indication of its place and date of publication or of its editor, it has been identified as an editorial project of Francesco del Tупpo printed in Naples between 1486 and 1490.<sup>61</sup> G.M. Monti knew of four copies, all in Neapolitan libraries.<sup>62</sup> A fifth now belongs to the John Rylands Library of the University of Manchester, and is the copy utilized for reference in the present study.<sup>63</sup> The *Cronaca* is the first text, whose usual introduction is prefaced by another: “Incomenza una nobilissima et vera antiqua cronica composta per lo generosissimo missere Iohanne Villano recolta da molti antiqui quale è delectevole et de gran piacere per sapere le antiquitate dello regno de Sicilia citra et ultra el faro in dela quale se tracta de mutamenti de multi stati et incomenza dala edificatione de Cuma. lege feliciter.” The *Cronaca* is followed by the “Later Angevin Chronicle” (treated as part of the *Cronaca*), and by a prose translation of Peter of Eboli’s *De balneis puteolarum*, different however from the “Trattato dei Bagni” found in a number of the manuscripts described above. This edition has long been rare, although it is impossible to know how widely it circulated in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Capasso, “Le fonti,” 595n., who dates the manuscript to the seventeenth century, and Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 41, who dates it, perhaps through a typographical error, to the “secolo XVIII” and notes that no information on it is available except for Capasso’s brief reference.

<sup>61</sup> On Francesco del Tупpo see the discussion in Chapter Five above at nn. 37–38.

<sup>62</sup> These are: Naples, SNSP, XXII E 4; Naples, Bibl. Naz., S.Q. IX B 3; *ibid.*, XIV B 46; *ibid.*, LV A 8. The last two copies are mutilated. See Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 41n.

<sup>63</sup> A photostat of this copy belongs to the Morgan Library of New York, which made it available to me.

<sup>64</sup> Erasmo Percopo studied this edition in his work on the Baths literature, one version of which this edition contains, and called it “rarissimo”: see “I Bagni di Pozzuoli. Poemetto napolitano del secolo XIV,” *ASPN* 11 (1886), 597–750, at 619.

## 1526 edition

This second edition was published in Naples by Evangelista de Presenzani of Pavia in 1526, edited by Leonardo Astrino of San Giovanni Rotondo, “on the initiative of” Antonio de Falco of Naples and Giacomo Bondino “de la insula de Manta,” (perhaps Malta). It bears the title “Cronache de l’inclita città de Napole, emendatissime con li Bagni.” Its version of the *Cronaca di Partenope* is substantially the same as that of the *editio princeps* but includes commentary inserted by its editor; it also divides the material into three books. Following the *Cronaca* in this edition is a vernacular translation of the so-called “Guida b,” yet another description of the ancient baths in the region around Pozzuoli.<sup>65</sup> This second edition survives in more copies than the first and may have circulated more widely in the sixteenth and following centuries.<sup>66</sup>

## 1680 edition

Published by Carlo Porsile in Naples, it included an integral reproduction of the 1526 edition alongside two other sixteenth-century works, Luigi Contarini’s *L’Antiquità di Napoli* and Benedetto di Falco’s *Descrittione dei luoghi antichi di Napoli*, all under the general title *Raccolta di varii libri overo opuscoli d’historie del regno di Napoli che con difficoltà si trovavano* .... Copies of this edition are fairly easily found, even in U.S. collections.<sup>67</sup>

*Manuscript Families: Group A and Group B*

As has long been recognized, the manuscript witnesses of the *Cronaca di Partenope* fall into two main groups. One version, which I call Group A, is found in the majority of manuscript copies (eleven of fourteen).<sup>68</sup> It

<sup>65</sup> Livio Petrucci, “Le fonti per la conoscenza,” 120–121.

<sup>66</sup> Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 42, calls it “abbastanza diffusa.”

<sup>67</sup> Yale’s Beinecke Library and the Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley both possess copies.

<sup>68</sup> In the total of fourteen I count the twelve textually significant manuscript copies and the two (N2 and VZ) that are no longer available for consultation, but about which enough can be known to establish their textual family. Those belonging to Group A are: P1, M1, F, V, N1, N2, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, and P3. N2, as noted above, contains only a fragment of the *Cronaca* and is not available for consultation, but the other contents of the manuscript suggest it belongs to this family. V, though unique toward the end of the *Cronaca*, largely follows the form and readings of Group A before chapter 57, and also contains other manuscript contents similar to those of the other Group A witnesses.



narrates Naples' history from its earliest origins to the accession of Joanna I in 1343, usually in 75 chapters.<sup>69</sup> It closes with the colophon dedicating the work to Louis of Taranto, second husband of Queen Joanna I, and identifying its author as Bartolomeo Caracciolo *detto* Carafa, knight of Naples. Six manuscripts (M1, N1, V, GC, SN2, and P3) preserve the introductory paragraph; P1, E, and P2 leave eight lines blank at the start, probably to fill in this introduction later as a rubric.<sup>70</sup> Group B is represented by manuscripts PL, E, and (to judge by the four chapters that have come down to us) VZ, and was the basis for all three early modern editions. It preserves the introduction, but lacks the colophon identifying its author and dedicatee, and narrates Naples' history in 96 rather than 75 chapters.<sup>71</sup> Manuscripts of Group B are also notable for containing no other contents besides the *Cronaca*.

Group B's greater length is attributable in part to the fact that it divides two chapters, 16 and 43. [As noted in the Chapter Two, I denote the different numeration of Group B with the letter "B" following the chapter number, e.g. chapter 20 (21B), or chapter 44 (46B)]. However, the principal cause of its greater length, according to previous scholars, is its interpolation of eighteen chapters drawn from the Florentine historian Giovanni Villani's early-fourteenth-century *Nuova Cronica*.<sup>72</sup> Apart from this interpolation, Group B's readings—specifically, the readings of manuscript PL, which is probably the earliest copy of either group—have been judged superior. Close comparison of the witnesses reveals that the differences between Groups A and B are both much greater and much more complicated than this explanation allows. These differences are crucial for identifying the original version of the *Cronaca*, its later adaptation, and its relationship to a third, closely-related text, and for this reason must be set out in some detail.

---

<sup>69</sup> SN1 conflates chapters 8–9, 16–17, 47–48, 64–65, 71–72, and 73–74; GC conflates chapters 65–66; SN2 and P3 conflate chapters 36–38 and 42–43.

<sup>70</sup> Both PL and N1 indeed copy the introduction entirely in red. SN1, also lacking the introduction, leaves no blank lines for it; N2, as noted above, contains only six chapters from the middle of the *Cronaca*.

<sup>71</sup> Because both E and VZ (according to di Giovanni's description) are mutilated at the end, PL is the only manuscript witness to include all 96 chapters. The first edition, however, includes the same final chapters as PL, suggesting that they were not unique to PL but integral to the progenitor of the Group B version. E also conflates chapters 51 (53B) and 52 (54B), but divides chapter 88B into two.

<sup>72</sup> This interpolation was first noted by G.M. Monti, "La 'Cronaca,'" 43–44 and repeated by A. Altamura, ed., *La Cronaca*, 37. For comparative purposes I use the edition of Villani by Giuseppe Porta (Parma, 1990–1991).

Group B does indeed include material very similar to eighteen chapters of Villani's *Nuova Cronica*. Chapters 66B–68B correspond to Villani's Book VI, chapters 1–3, while chapters 75B–89B correspond to Villani VII: 87–91 and VIII: 1–10. What earlier scholars failed to notice, however, is that Group B diverges substantially from Group A for far more of its narration: from the second half of chapter 60 (62B) to the end of the text. Sometimes it simply re-organizes and paraphrases information found elsewhere in Group A.<sup>73</sup> A very large proportion of its account from chapter 62B forward, however, including all eighteen chapters attributed to Villani's *Nuova Cronica*, can be found in another text: the "Southernized Villani" which, as noted in the manuscript descriptions above, follows directly after the *Cronaca di Partenope* in most Group A manuscripts.

The very close parallels between these two works indicate that the "Southernized Villani" either borrowed from, or served as a source for, the Group B version of the *Cronaca di Partenope*. Its relationship to our text is yet more complicated, however, for in certain passages—for instance, the description of King Roger II, the list of counts enfeoffed by King Charles I, and the list of King Charles II's children—there is close correspondence not only between the "Southernized Villani" and the *Cronaca* Group B, but between these two and the *Cronaca* Group A. None of these passages is found in Villani's *Nuova Cronica*. Who, then, borrowed from whom? Internal dating evidence is of no help: the "Southernized Villani" ends its borrowings from Villani's *Nuova Cronica* around 1323, but nothing prevents a considerably later date of composition. Nor is manuscript evidence useful, for the earliest copies of all three texts are of roughly the same vintage (circa 1400).

The relationship between these texts can be imagined in various configurations, but the most plausible scenario is as follows. The Group A version of the *Cronaca* was composed first. The "Southernized Villani" was composed next, relying mostly on Giovanni Villani's *Nuova Cronica* but including some information found in the *Cronaca* Group A, as well as some original material, to expand its narration of southern Italian affairs. The Group B version of the *Cronaca* was composed last, borrowing extensively from the "Southernized Villani" from chapter 62B forward.

---

<sup>73</sup> Chapter 70B, for instance, corresponds in large part to narrative dispersed across chapters 63 to 65 of Group A, while 73B weaves together some unique narrative with phrases found in chapters 67A and 69A.

To illustrate this hypothesis, let us consider first the relationship of the “Southernized Villani” to the *Cronaca* Group B. That the former served as the source for the latter makes sense in terms of the two works’ overall structure. That is, since the main purpose of the “Southernized Villani” was to excerpt Villani, which it did for most of its 168 chapters, it is much easier to imagine that this work was created first and that the *Cronaca* Group B selected from it only a few of these borrowed Villani chapters along with some other material original to the “SV.” If the reverse were true, we would have to imagine that the “SV” author came across the *Cronaca* Group B, recognized its Villani borrowings, then went back to the original Villani and excerpted it directly and much more extensively, placing those chapters drawn from the *Cronaca* Group B in just the right spot (for it follows Villani’s chapter sequence exactly, albeit with gaps) while at the same time including some of the original material found in the *Cronaca* Group B.

Secondly, for the most part the “SV” renders Villani’s text more exactly than does the *Cronaca* Group B. If we examine the first chapter in which both the “SV” and *Cronaca* B echo Villani VI:1, we find that the “SV” consistently copies Villani faithfully, while the *Cronaca* B makes small changes, omissions, and additions.<sup>74</sup> The *Cronaca* B reverses the first two sentences of the chapter, and gives the following variants:

Villani VI:1 and “SV” chapter 12	<i>Cronaca</i> B chapter 66
bontadoso	buono
tucto arso et disfece	si brugiao tucto et diffeciolo
hobediò	volve hobedire
puosi ad hoste et vensela	s’impuose l’assedio et per assedio l’ebe
sisma et affliccione	sisima
ducato di Spolito	ducato

The *Cronaca* B also gives the length of Alexander III’s pontificate (1159–1181) as twelve (XII) years, whereas Villani and the “SV” give XXII. Even more telling is the passage on the four counts enfeoffed by Charles I. This appears in the *Cronaca* A at the end of chapter 69. It appears in the “SV” at chapter 60, with an additional comment—the count of Marsico is here described as a “valiant man in his person.” But it appears in the *Cronaca* B

---

<sup>74</sup> For the purposes of these comparisons, I use PL to represent the *Cronaca* Group B and M1’s copy of the “SV.” Readings from Villani are taken from the edition of Giuseppe Porta (Parma, 1990–1991).

twice. It first appears in 73B, a chapter that shows no connection to the “SV” but cobbles together information found in two separate chapters of the *Cronaca A*. It appears the second time in 90B, much of whose narrative corresponds exactly or very closely to parts of six “SV” chapters, including chapter 60, and here its list of counts has the same additional phrase found in “SV” 60. The *Cronaca B*’s repetition of this passage, the way that the passage is connected on the first occasion to more general borrowings from the *Cronaca A* and on the second to the “SV,” as well as its significant telescoping, in 90B, of narrative dispersed across a number of “SV” chapters, strongly suggests that the “SV” was its source and not vice versa.

There is, however, one case in which the *Cronaca B* is closer to Villani than is the “SV” in the opening lines of *Cronaca* chapter 76B. The corresponding chapter of the “SV” (39) adds detail not found in the original Villani text (VII: 88). This may represent a later alteration in the “SV” copies consulted in this comparison: I have found no other instances where the *Cronaca B* is more faithful to Villani. The fact that we have no autograph of any of these works is obviously an obstacle to determining their temporal relationship. On balance, however, the textual comparisons lean very heavily in favor of the precedence of the “SV” to the *Cronaca* Group B.

As for the precedence of the *Cronaca A* to the “SV,” one index is the absence, in the *Cronaca A*, of echoes of Villani’s work. The narration of royal history in the “SV” is drawn principally from the *Nuova Cronica*. If the *Cronaca A*, which covers the same basic events, utilized the “SV” as a source, it would be virtually impossible to avoid some echoes of Villani. Yet none are there: the only correspondences between the “SV” and the *Cronaca A* are passages lacking from Villani. Another good test is to compare their respective accounts, where they are substantially similar, to the known source-text. Much of the narrative regarding the Normans derives ultimately from the late-twelfth-century *Romualdi salernitani chronicon*, and where the translation is close, *Cronaca A* is slightly more faithful to its source.<sup>75</sup> One example is the description of Roger II in chapter 61A, also found in the “SV” chapter 9. Both offer serviceable vernacular translations, but *Cronaca A* is a little more exact. The same is true in the following chapter, where the “SV” diverges

---

<sup>75</sup> Ed. L. Muratori, with updated editorial apparatus by C.A. Garufi, in *RIS*, vol. 7, part 1 (Città del Castello, 1914–1935).

more from Romuald in its account of the imprisonment of King William I and, though slightly, in its physical description of him.<sup>76</sup>

The final piece of evidence in favor of the proposed direction of borrowing regards the overall contents of the manuscripts in which these works are found. As we have seen, the “SV” follows immediately after the *Cronaca A* in most manuscripts, and is found nowhere else. The *Cronaca B* is always the sole work in the manuscripts containing it. We can therefore easily imagine how the borrowings occurred in the direction I have proposed. The “SV” author had at hand a copy of the original, Group A *Cronaca*. His project was mostly to excerpt Villani, but as he had a particular interest in southern Italian affairs, he borrowed some passages from *Cronaca A*, including those ultimately derived from Romuald’s chronicle (which he translated with a bit more freedom, and embellished in ways taking his account further from Romuald). He also added some original anecdotes of his own. The *Cronaca* and the “SV” came to circulate together, apparently rather quickly. (Indeed, it is possible that the “SV” author copied his work into a manuscript already containing the *Cronaca A*, and that this manuscript became the ancestor of all other known A copies.) The progenitor of the *Cronaca B* version, then, came upon a manuscript containing these two contiguous texts, and noting their considerable overlap, decided to conflate them. Preferring in many (but not all) cases the longer version of royal affairs in the “SV,” he incorporated its narrative into his version of the *Cronaca* itself; and having borrowed what he wished from the “SV,” he did not copy it out as a separate work, but concluded his manuscript with the now-expanded *Cronaca* alone.

For those particularly interested in the relationships between these works, it may be worth mentioning a curious feature of the *Cronaca B* text: its author’s uncanny knack for excerpting from the “SV” only the phrases or passages that are original to it, omitting the surrounding narrative that was copied from Giovanni Villani. One example is chapter 62B. The beginning of this chapter is identical in Group A (chapter 60), the “SV” (chapter 8), and Group B. The “SV” then adds a paragraph drawn from Villani V:20 in the middle, and closes with original narrative (essentially a paraphrase of the rest of *Cronaca* chapter 60A). Group B skips over the paragraph drawn from Villani, and proceeds

---

<sup>76</sup> For detailed discussion of these relationships, see the notes to the relevant chapters in Appendix I below.

directly with the new paraphrase found in “SV.” A second example is chapter 72B, corresponding to the “SV” chapter 34. Most of this “SV” chapter copies Villani VII: 44, but it offers a different and longer account of Conrad Staufen’s siege of Naples in mid-chapter and adds a new anecdote about Conrad’s spy at the end of the chapter. Again, the Group B progenitor omitted the surrounding narrative copied from Villani, and borrowed only the two original passages of the “SV,” placing them back-to-back. The long chapter 90B is very complicated, for it borrowed some passages from several chapters of the *Cronaca* Group A and other passages from disparate chapters of the “SV.” For present purposes, however, it is striking that it selected, from “SV” chapter 92, only the original mention of Charles I’s construction of Castel Nuovo, whereas the rest of this “SV” chapter, a copy of Villani VIII: 95, was passed over.

How was the Group B progenitor able to distinguish between the original passages of the “SV” and those culled from Villani? One possibility—that the Group B progenitor and the “SV” author were the same person—can be dismissed: as noted in Chapter Five above, the two authors had quite different attitudes toward the Staufen, each altering the core narrative of the *Cronaca* A but in opposite ways. A second possibility is that the Group B progenitor was familiar with Giovanni Villani’s work, and could therefore identify what was original to the “SV.” A third possibility is that the Group B progenitor selected only original “SV” passages because of their content: the “SV” author had added them to expand his account of southern Italian affairs, and this was also the principal interest of the Group B progenitor. This last possibility gains more credence when we examine a counter-example: in chapter 71B, the *Cronaca* B focused mostly on an original addition by the “SV” author concerning the death and burial in Naples of Pope Innocent IV, but he also added some of the surrounding narrative originally found in Villani’s work. Furthermore, the *Cronaca* B mistakenly placed this event in the reign of Frederick II, whereas the “SV,” like Villani, indicated that it occurred in the subsequent reign of his son Conrad—an error that would be difficult to make if the *Cronaca* B author were the same person as the “SV” author or even had Villani’s text before him.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Conrad Staufen and Innocent IV both died in 1254, though Conrad predeceased the pope by some six months. Villani and the “SV” thus err, but only slightly, in stating that the pope died during Conrad’s reign. The *Cronaca* B, which places the pope’s death at least four years earlier, cannot therefore be considered an intentional correction of the “SV.”

Finally, the Group B progenitor made his own additions to the *Cronaca* text. Sometimes they were small details, like the characterization of Giovanni of Procida as physician to King Manfred in chapter 90B. Sometimes they were significant, as when he extended the end of the narrative to recount the murder of Joanna I's first husband, Andrew of Hungary. As has been noted, the scandal of this murder, and the doubt it cast on the legitimate rule of Louis of Taranto (who was briefly under suspicion for involvement in it) made it a fact Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa judged best to pass over in silence. But the *Cronaca* B author, who wrote in a later decade when these matters were less sensitive, and who shows concern to emphasize legitimate succession, evidently found the murder too significant to be omitted.

Having established that the Group A version of the *Cronaca* was the original and traced how the Group B version came to be composed, let us return to the comparison of these two versions. The foregoing description has examined only the major divergence between them, from the end of chapter 60 (62B) forward. But Group B differs notably from Group A even in its earlier chapters. It places some verses of Virgil's *Aeneid* at the end of chapter 3, whereas Group A places them, more logically and with an introductory phrase, in chapter 2. It omits Latin quotations, offering only the vernacular translation, in chapters 7, 15, and 40 (41B). It ends chapter 29 (30B) quite differently, and in the following chapter has a longer passage on how Virgil protected his magic egg. In the short chapter 33 (34B), on the Neapolitan church of Ara Petri, it offers a different rendering of same information. In chapter 45 (47B), it has a shorter passage on the construction of the church of S Silvestro dello Capo. It shortens and alters passages throughout chapter 48 (50B), and omits two long sentences in the middle of chapter 51 (53B). These are just a few of the more significant variations, all of which are noted in the following edition. They may suffice here to indicate that Group B differs from Group A throughout its text, and not just in "Part II."

#### *Distinctions among the Group B Witnesses*

Also significant are the variations that distinguish the two complete witnesses of Group B, manuscripts PL and E. Often their differences can be attributed to an error in E, the later copy. However, in numerous instances E matches the readings of Group A, leaving PL isolated as a unique witness. To name a few examples: in chapter 3, Group A and E

offer “infestao,” versus PL’s “assagliò”; in chapter 4, “habitacione,” versus PL’s “stansia;” in chapter 5, “si amalò,” versus PL’s “infermò;” in chapter 7, “nobilissima,” versus PL’s “notabili;” in chapter 19(20B), “avendo de cio,” versus PL’s “stimolati di.” As these examples indicate, PL’s unique variants are not attributable to scribal error, but rather represent the selection of a synonymous word or roughly equal phrase. This is also true of longer passages. In chapter 6, for instance, E matches a majority reading from Group A with “impercio dentro di loro son nate brighe et discordie per loro richeze et altre habundantie,” while PL offers “intro di casa per la gran ricchezza et habundantia fo nate brighe e discordie inter de ipsi.” (Two manuscripts of Group A offer yet a third version: it was apparently a difficult passage.) The point for present purposes is that PL offers a unique paraphrase, and that E accords, sometimes exactly, with the version found in most or all Group A copies. In other cases, PL adds a phrase found nowhere else (e.g. chapter 21(22), “et non pigliava altro colore ni odore overo sapore”), or commits a *saut de même au même* where E, like Group A, retains the text (e.g. in chapter 29 [30B], at “niuna cosa”).

It is possible that E’s affinities with Group A copies are the result of contamination, which is common among Group A copies, as we shall see in a moment. I find this explanation unlikely, however. In chapter 31 (32B), it is true that E, like most Group A copies, omits the passage on Chironte that was probably original to the work and that is found, in part, in PL. However E’s omission is easily explained as a *saut de même au même* on the word “Chironte.” Otherwise E’s readings in this chapter follow PL, and do not contain any of the other alterations found in Group A copies. Another example occurs in chapter 20 (21B). Here PL ends on the word “pusare,” thus lacking the last thirty-five words found in Group A copies, whereas E includes eleven more words than PL. If E were contaminated by a Group A witness, one might reasonably expect it to include the entire passage, as all Group A copies do.

The more likely explanation is that E, although copied some ninety years later than PL, has a closer affinity to their common ancestor. That ancestor must have possessed the structural changes involving the “Southernized Villani,” the transposition of *Aeneid* verses, and the division of chapters, which are common to both PL and E. But that ancestor must also have retained many of the individual readings of the original, which can be identified by their inclusion in both E and Group A. Despite this closer relation to its ancestor, E includes a large number of unique errors that diminish its value as a witness to the original. As for



PL, although probably the earliest extant manuscript, is at least two stages removed from the original text: through the alterations involving the borrowings from the “Southernized Villani” and other structural changes, and through the additional, unique variants that distance it from the readings common to E and Group A. Earlier scholars have judged PL the best witness to the *Cronaca*, at least for “Part I” (i.e. through chapter 55).<sup>78</sup> Given the findings described above, this judgment can no longer hold.

Regarding manuscript VZ, the four chapters published by di Giovanni correspond to chapters 73–76B, which are distinctive enough from Group A’s narrative here to demonstrate that the manuscript belongs to this family.<sup>79</sup>

While Group B is certainly the later version of the *Cronaca* and has many distinctive characteristics, it is in one case an essential witness, retaining a phrase absent from all Group A copies but that must have been in the original. This is in chapter 40 (41B), where all Group A manuscripts commit a *saut de même au même* on the word “Salvatore,” rendering the passage nonsensical, and the missing phrase, found in the Group B copies, is also attested in the known source-text (the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio* or *SMP*).<sup>80</sup>

There are several other cases where the Group B reading conforms to the known source-text, but the Group A reading is still sensical. Group B gives the distych in chapter 19 (20B) in the same order as the source-text (Eustazio of Matera’s *Planctus Italie*, via “Commentary V”), whereas Group A witnesses reverse the lines. In chapter 41 (42B), Group B offers information on the Greek churches founded by Constantine in the same sequence as the source-text (the *SMP*), whereas Group A manuscripts shift the sentences around. Finally, Group B adds a sentence to the end of chapter 43 (45B) that is found in the source-text, here again the *SMP*. Given Group B’s conformity with the known sources, these passages may well have been in the original *Cronaca*. That possibility, in turn, raises the question whether other “variant” Group B readings might

<sup>78</sup> Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 46; Altamura, ed., *La Cronaca*, 29.

<sup>79</sup> According to Altamura (ed. cit., 35), the four chapters transcribed by di Giovanni indicated that VZ did not accord with PL and E (the Group B manuscripts). Yet di Giovanni himself offered PL’s readings in his notes, which indicate the very few divergences between the two copies, and my own comparison has confirmed it. The proof Altamura offers on p. 29—that VZ lacks a chapter interpolated from Villani—is immaterial: VZ was certainly incomplete, as di Giovanni had noted, but what text we now have corresponds closely to the B manuscripts and not at all to Group A.

<sup>80</sup> See the edition of the *SMP* by G.M. Monti, “Il cosiddetto ‘Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio,’” at 141.

also be original, where we have no source-text to serve as a control. I consider this unlikely with regard to the transposition of the *Aeneid* verses, where the Group A placement makes more sense, and all but impossible where Group B witnesses omit a Latin quotation, retaining only the vernacular translation. But it is possible in other cases. On the other hand, it is equally possible that the Group A text, though divergent from its source, is nonetheless original, and that the Group B progenitor “corrected” his copy. This seems to be what happened in chapter 54 (56B), where Group A copies identify the reigning pope as Gregory IV but Group B copies identify him as Leo IV. Though Leo IV appears to be more historically accurate, it is likely that Gregory IV was the original reading.<sup>81</sup> If the Group B progenitor had access to the *SMP* and to Eustazio of Matera’s poem (either directly or via “Commentary V”), he could well have “corrected” his exemplar in the above-named passages as well. Given that the Group B text overall shows major alterations to the original, it has seemed best to treat its readings as variants except in the case of the *saut* on “Salvatore” mentioned above.

There are four more passages where one or both Group B witnesses accord with one or two Group A manuscripts in retaining a passage that other copies appear to have lost through a *saut de même au même*.<sup>82</sup> Here, the agreement between manuscripts of both families, along with the likelihood of a *saut* in other copies, is helpful in indicating what was likely the original passage, and further illustrates the value of the Group B witnesses.

Finally, the Group B text is significant in terms of its circulation. Although it survives now in only two complete manuscript copies, its version had a wider circulation than that survival rate suggests. The lost manuscript VZ can now be added to this family. We can also infer the existence of a common exemplar for PL and E, what I have been calling the “Group B progenitor,” and we can infer the existence of another copy that served as the model for the first edition of 1486–1490, which

---

<sup>81</sup> See the discussion of this chapter in Appendix I below.

<sup>82</sup> These are: a *saut* on “Grecia” in chapter 41 (42B), with the missing text found in one Group A copy (SN1) and in both Group B copies; *sauts* on “per ipso” in chapter 36 (37B) and on “grandissimi” in chapter 53 (55B), with missing text found in two Group A copies (SN1 and V) and in both Group B copies; and a probable *saut* on “Chironte” in chapter 31 (32B), where the missing text is found in two Group A copies (SN1 and V) and, partially, in PL. Where the reading of the base manuscript is nonsensical without the missing words, I supply them in brackets in the main text; where the base manuscript is still sensible, however, I retain it in the main text, and note the likely originality of the variant reading in Appendix I.

certainly belonged to Group B but was neither PL nor E. Indeed, since the Group B version of the text was transmitted in all early editions of the *Cronaca*, it circulated even more widely than the original, Group A version from the sixteenth century forward, and is important for understanding the reception of the work in that period.

### *Copies of the Group A Text*

Let us now return to the eleven manuscripts containing the original version of the *Cronaca*. Whereas Group B manuscripts contain the *Cronaca* alone, Group A manuscripts include a number of other contents, and show considerable similarity in their selection, as can be seen in Chart 1. In ten of these eleven manuscripts, the *Cronaca* is immediately followed by the “Southernized Villani.” The exception is V, which, as we will see, is unusual in many respects; with regard to overall contents, however, it must be noted that its copy of the *Cronaca* is incomplete and that its other contents seem to have been shuffled in a later rebinding, such that the absence of the “Southernized Villani” in the extant manuscript may not represent its original state. Secondly, almost all manuscripts follow these two texts with the “Universal Villani Excerpt.” The exception is P<sub>1</sub>, but P<sub>1</sub> is mutilated at precisely this point, its copy of the preceding work, the “Southernized Villani,” being incomplete. Thus again, the absence of the “Universal Villani Excerpt” may not be indicative of its exemplar or original state.

Following contents show lesser but still noteworthy consistency from copy to copy. Taking P<sub>1</sub> out of consideration for these later contents since it was clearly mutilated, we find that most manuscripts also included the “Sito et conditione de Campagna” (nine of ten); the list of kings of ancient Israel (the six earliest witnesses); the poem inc. “Pietà pietà o summo Jove” (found in five of ten, and followed in four of those five cases by the second poem, inc. “Amore Ihu”); the “Trattato dei Bagni” (seven of ten); and the southern-Italian translation of Petrarch’s *Itinerarium* (five of ten). Also noteworthy is the fact that P<sub>1</sub> and M<sub>1</sub>, the earliest manuscripts of this group, copy the same three texts before the *Cronaca* (the bull of Clement IV, “De romano imperatore,” and the list of regional bishoprics).

Regarding the text of the *Cronaca* itself, chapter division is fairly consistent, but the use of chapter titles is not. P<sub>1</sub>, F, and P<sub>2</sub> have none; M<sub>1</sub> and V have some; N<sub>1</sub> entitles most but not all chapters. The same occasional use of titles can be found in Group B manuscripts, for instance PL.

The late manuscripts SN<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> use them consistently, and a different hand added them to SN<sub>1</sub>, but even relatively late manuscripts might omit them.<sup>83</sup> Consecutive chapter numeration between works was an innovation of the sixteenth century. In two late-fifteenth-century manuscripts, N<sub>1</sub> and SN<sub>1</sub>, a later hand added consecutive chapter numbers to the *Cronaca* and the “Southernized Villani,” while the copyists of SN<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> gave consecutive chapter numeration for all four works they copied. This may reflect the influence of the printed editions of the *Cronaca*, which did feature numbered chapters; as noted in the manuscript descriptions above, later owners frequently compared their own manuscript with a printed edition, as signalled in their quotation of the second edition’s title, attribution of the work to Giovanni Villani, or emendation of chapter division to accord with that of the editions.

In terms of the *Cronaca*’s content, manuscript N<sub>2</sub> cannot be discussed because it is no longer available for consultation in any form, and in any case contained only a very few chapters of our work. The remaining ten Group A manuscripts do not separate neatly into textual families. A few examples of their various combinations will illustrate this.

In some cases, P<sub>1</sub>, F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, and P<sub>3</sub> share common errors or variants, while M<sub>1</sub>, V, and GC offer an alternate and sometimes manifestly better reading. (The chapter in which the reading appears is given in parentheses in the left column.)

M <sub>1</sub> , V, GC	P <sub>1</sub> , F, N <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>2</sub> , SN <sub>1</sub> , SN <sub>2</sub> , P <sub>3</sub>
Omne arte mathematica (2)	omne mathematica
Mencione ... suoy (2)	mencione ... suoy <i>om.</i>
Inello ... vicini (3)	inello ... vicini <i>om.</i>
Laborature (4)	li habitaturi
Alebat (5)	habeat
Grandissima bellecze (5)	grandissima et nobile bellecze

In other places, however, P<sub>1</sub> joins the group at left:

P <sub>1</sub> , M <sub>1</sub> , V, GC	F, N <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>2</sub> , SN <sub>1</sub> , SN <sub>2</sub> , P <sub>3</sub>
Lèbe ipso (7)	de po ipso
Che vendere no se potea (21)	ad vendere

---

<sup>83</sup> P<sub>2</sub>, for instance, which is closely related to P<sub>1</sub>, has no chapter titles at all, while GC, like M<sub>1</sub> to which it is generally quite similar, contains a few.

In yet others, SN<sub>1</sub> joins the group at left:

M <sub>1</sub> , V, SN <sub>1</sub> , GC	P <sub>1</sub> , F, N <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>2</sub> , SN <sub>2</sub> , P <sub>3</sub>
Carrafa ponere fece (30)	carrafa lo posse
Consequentemente (5)	consequente
<i>Latin couplet</i> (19)	<i>Latin couplet om.</i>
<i>Epitaph and last line</i> (27)	<i>epitaph and last line om.</i>
Cappelle (36)	ample
Xpo san Pietro (35)	xpo sempiterno

In the last example above, unusually, the witnesses in the left column are in error.

F, P<sub>2</sub> and SN<sub>1</sub> sometimes agree in variants shared by no other witnesses:

M <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>1</sub> , N <sub>1</sub> , V, GC, SN <sub>2</sub> , P <sub>3</sub>	F, P <sub>2</sub> , SN <sub>1</sub>
È dicto (1) <sup>84</sup>	vole dire
Eciam Dio (3)	chi
Et peterono (4)	et peterono <i>om.</i>
Si allochino et (4)	si allochino et <i>om.</i>
In quel medesimo loco (4)	cosci là
Inpercio ... nate (6)	non per spacio ... gran
Per loro ... habundancie (6)	<i>om.</i>
Infirmitate (23)	salute
De Salerno (60)	de Salerno <i>om.</i>

But for at least one reading, V joins the group at right in omitting a phrase:

M <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>1</sub> , N <sub>1</sub> , GC, SN <sub>2</sub> , P <sub>3</sub>	F, P <sub>2</sub> , SN <sub>1</sub> , V
Sepulcro overo (3)	<i>om.</i>

F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, and P<sub>3</sub> sometimes share readings:

M <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>1</sub> , V, SN <sub>1</sub> , GC	F, N <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>2</sub> , SN <sub>2</sub> , P <sub>3</sub>
Luoco (3)	lito
Collocare (30)	alegare/allocare
Glorioso (33)	gloriosissimo
Dove (43)	alo quale sedia
Audendo ... voltandose (47)	similmente ... fece vuto <sup>85</sup>

<sup>84</sup> N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub>, and P<sub>3</sub> give a variant reading for a larger surrounding passage.

<sup>85</sup> N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, and P<sub>3</sub> add an extra phrase in this variant reading compared to F and P<sub>2</sub>.

On other occasions, F and P<sub>2</sub> move from the group at right (sometimes because their readings are unique, sometimes because in accord with other copies), leaving N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, and P<sub>3</sub> to share common variants:

M <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>1</sub> , F, P <sub>2</sub> , V, SN <sub>1</sub> , GC	N <sub>1</sub> , SN <sub>2</sub> , P <sub>3</sub>
Che Cuma in greco in latino è dicto (1) <sup>86</sup>	che tanto vene ad dire Cuma in greco dormire quanto in latino dormire
tranquillitate (2)	tranquillitate stecte
ancora (24)	allora
in qui (27) <sup>87</sup>	ad mo
incomperabile (34)	incorporabile
anbe duy (34)	tucti duy
sancto bono homo (34) <sup>88</sup>	facto bono
largetze (43) <sup>89</sup>	allegreze o devocione
avendone ... divorati (47) <sup>90</sup>	dubitando ... fortuna <sup>91</sup>

SN<sub>2</sub>, however, moves to the left column in retaining a passage on which N<sub>1</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> alone commit a *saut de même au même*:

M <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>1</sub> , F, P <sub>2</sub> , V, SN <sub>1</sub> , GC, SN <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>3</sub>
<i>no saut</i> (14) F	<i>saut</i> on “fortellecza”

SN<sub>1</sub> and V are sometimes alone in retaining a passage omitted from all other Group A manuscripts, but that is likely original because it is found in Group B manuscripts and because the remaining Group A manuscripts commit a *saut de même au même*:

V, SN <sub>1</sub>	M <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>1</sub> , F, N <sub>1</sub> , P <sub>2</sub> , GC, SN <sub>2</sub> , P <sub>3</sub>
<i>no saut</i> (36)	<i>Saut</i> on “per epso” <sup>92</sup>
<i>no saut</i> (53)	<i>Saut</i> on “grandissime”
<i>no saut</i> (31)	<i>saut</i> on “Chironte”

<sup>86</sup> F, P<sub>2</sub> and SN<sub>1</sub> read “vol dire” for “è dicto.”

<sup>87</sup> F, P<sub>2</sub> and SN<sub>1</sub> read “al presente.”

<sup>88</sup> P<sub>1</sub> reads only “sancto,” while F and P<sub>2</sub> rewrite a much longer passage

<sup>89</sup> P<sub>2</sub> again rewrites the whole surrounding phrase.

<sup>90</sup> P<sub>2</sub> telescopes the latter part of this phrase, but otherwise accords more closely with the other copies in this column.

<sup>91</sup> N<sub>1</sub> adds the phrase “et tempesta de mare” at the end of this rather long variant reading.

<sup>92</sup> P<sub>2</sub> offers a paraphrase for the whole surrounding passage. N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, and P<sub>3</sub> also omit the two words before the common *saut de même au même*, “per epso.”

Two other passages show yet more unusual combinations. In the important matter of the introduction, P<sub>1</sub>, F, P<sub>2</sub>, and SN<sub>1</sub> all omit it, whereas the other witnesses retain it. In chapter 14, M<sub>1</sub> and N<sub>1</sub> alone retain a passage regarding the *seggio* of Capuana, where all others commit a *saut* on the word “Capuana.”

In a work of this length, many more examples could be given, but these few may suffice to indicate the complexity of the relationships among Group A witnesses. There was evidently a high degree of contamination between copies. N<sub>1</sub>, for instance, often shares variants with P<sub>1</sub>; though it introduces many more, these can be attributed to its later date. Yet N<sub>1</sub> cannot descend from P<sub>1</sub>, for it retains the introduction. P<sub>3</sub> shares many readings with N<sub>1</sub>, which suggests a close relationship between them; P<sub>3</sub> being the later copy, it would appear to descend from N<sub>1</sub>. But N<sub>1</sub> contains a number of errors not found in P<sub>3</sub>, such as “*estris*” for “*terris*” in chapter 2, “*piovi*” for “*veri chiove*” in chapter 48, “*ferro*” for “*freno*” again in chapter 48, and “*portato*” for “*mandato*” in chapter 50. N<sub>1</sub> also omits some words or phrases retained in P<sub>3</sub>, such as “*non perdonando*” in chapter 50, where the P<sub>3</sub> copyist cannot be imagined to have reconstituted the missing words from context.

Manuscript F's relationships with other witnesses provide a good example of how gnarled the genealogical tree of the Group A manuscripts must be. It shares some variants with the earlier P<sub>1</sub>, including the omission of the introduction and the variants found in the first list above. F could therefore be considered a distant descendant of P<sub>1</sub> (although they are only some forty to fifty years apart), except that P<sub>1</sub> has errors not found in F, such as “*correccione*” for “*corrucione*” in chapter 3, and “*terreni*” for “*termini*” in chapter 10. Sometimes F joins P<sub>1</sub> and N<sub>1</sub> in error (for instance, writing “*focho*” for “*ioco*” in chapter 26 [27B]), yet more often P<sub>1</sub> and N<sub>1</sub> accord and F does not, while at other times F and N<sub>1</sub> share a variant where P<sub>1</sub> retains the majority reading (as in the variant list starting with “*luoco*” above). SN<sub>1</sub> sometimes agrees in error with the earlier F, but more often retains a majority reading where F diverges. Even P<sub>2</sub>, which has the closest relationship to F, does not always follow it in variant readings, as we will see in a moment. SN<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub>, which are the latest manuscript copies and closely related to each other, sometimes follow F in variant readings, including rather significant paraphrases; however, they cannot descend directly from F, for they lack some of the most significant paraphrases (for instance, in chapter 34 [35B]), while sometimes agreeing with N<sub>1</sub> in variants not found in F. The difficulty of visualizing these shifting alliances in a *stemma* can be imagined.

Despite the generally high degree of contamination between copies, three are sufficiently close to a predecessor to open up the possibility of direct descent. The first is GC, which, although containing numerous errors, generally accords with M1 and is almost never to be grouped with other copies (for instance, some combination of P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3) against M1's readings. The exceptions are cases where multiple copyists could easily have committed the same error independently of each other, for instance in committing a *saut* on "Roma" in chapter 8 (as did N1, V, and SN1) or writing "Salerno" for "Falerno" in chapter 6 (as did P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, and P3). Substituting "romani" for "nolani" in the title of chapter 9, as did N1 and P3, is more curious, but the context of this and the preceding chapter make it an equally plausible reading and could well be due to the GC copyist's independent "correction" of M1 or of one of its descendants. Still, it is surprising how many times the GC copyist corrects small errors in M1, given that he is often quite sloppy and commits numerous unique scribal errors. He did not repeat the long phrase copied twice in M1 in chapter 19. He corrects M1's "Brinsi" to "Brindisi" in chapter 32, M1's "paczo" to "palacio" in chapter 43, and in chapter 39, corrects "duci" to "dudeci," "facta a troyani" to "facta de troiani," and "pontata" to "portata." Perhaps most surprising, he gives the majority date (787) at the start of chapter 50, whereas M1 alone gives 888. These examples do not prove that GC could not have descended from M1, but they do call it into question.

Similarly, there is a very close relationship between F and the later P2, which share the vast majority of their variant readings, including paraphrases of considerable length. Nonetheless, it is unlikely that P2 descends directly from F, for it retains the majority reading in some cases where F (either alone or with other, later copies) offers a variant. For instance, where F adds "cose" after "finalmente" in chapter 34 (35B), P2 does not; where F writes "larghecze indulgencie" in chapter 44 (46B), P2 offers the standard reading "larghe"; in chapter 46 (48B), F reads "conversatione" instead of the correct "conversione" found in P2; in chapter 47 (49B) F omits the phrase "et la ymagine," which P2 retains; in chapter 63A the proper "speciale" is rendered "spirituale" in F alone.

P3, however, very likely does descend directly from the earlier SN2. Both copies, and only these two copies, place chapter 13 after chapter 15. In chapter 63A, both transpose a phrase on the length of Frederick II's reign in Jerusalem to the middle of the following sentence, disrupting the passages' sense. Both make a large number of unusual scribal errors, such



as “littere dermone” for “litterale sermone” in chapter 35, and “polita” for “povertate” in chapter 39. Only these two copies offer titles for all chapters except 37, 38, and 43, which these copies start on new lines but with no blank space separating them from the preceding chapter; the chapter titles they do offer are very similar or identical. Where the copies differ, it is generally because of an error introduced by P<sub>3</sub>, the later copy. I have found only one instance where P<sub>3</sub> does not follow SN<sub>2</sub> in a variant: in chapter 50 (52B), where SN<sub>2</sub> reads *luglio*, P<sub>3</sub> has the majority reading *iugno*. SN<sub>2</sub>’s reading however is somewhat ambiguous: the initial “l,” though not dotted, could be read as an “i,” and the difference between “gli” and “gn” involves only the height of the downstroke of the “l.” It is possible, therefore, that the P<sub>3</sub> copyist read the word in SN<sub>2</sub> as *iuglio*, which he corrected to *iugno*, or even as *iugno*. This one reading could, however, indicate that P<sub>3</sub> is not a direct descendant of SN<sub>2</sub>, in which case they shared a very near common ancestor.

All told, the foregoing comparison suggests that a large number of manuscripts of the *Cronaca* must have circulated in the later fourteenth and following centuries that are now lost. It also indicates the minimal utility of attempting a *stemma codicum*.<sup>93</sup> It may, however, be useful to provide a thumbnail portrait of each manuscript of the Group A text, whose precise variations can to some extent be tracked in the following edition.

P<sub>1</sub> is the earliest Group A copy and overall a good witness. Previous scholars, who were unaware of the existence of M<sub>1</sub>, considered it the best witness of this group. Its drawbacks, however, are obvious: it lacks the introduction, omits several Latin passages, and commits a number of *sauts de même au même*, as well as other, more minor errors. Most of its flaws are omissions, and apart from these it tends to have solid readings, with few unique errors, paraphrases, or additions.

M<sub>1</sub> is a few decades later than P<sub>1</sub> and very similar to it, but has the advantage of retaining the introduction and the Latin passages omitted from P<sub>1</sub>. It shares a few, relatively minor errors with P<sub>1</sub>, and adds a few more (some unique, some shared with other copies). On the whole, however, it has very little in the way of idiosyncrasies. Both its early

---

<sup>93</sup> Monti, “La ‘Cronaca,’” 45 offered a *stemma codicum* for “Part I,” and Altamura a *stemma* for each of the three “parts” he edited (*La Cronaca*, 36, 40, 47). The very simplistic nature of those offered for Parts I and II (the only ones that ought to be considered integral to the original work) indicates their limited utility, and does not reflect a detailed analysis of variants between copies.

date and its generally solid readings make it the best candidate for base manuscript, its small errors being easily corrected with reference to other copies.

F has been described in some detail above. It is the third-earliest surviving Group A manuscript but already exhibits significant paraphrasing of the text. Many of its variant readings are found in the later P2 and some in the later N1, SN1, SN2, and P3 (either together or in subgroups), but none of these descend directly from it. Nor is its relationship to the earlier P1 straightforward, for though they sometimes agree in variants, F is occasionally more faithful to the majority reading than is P1. Its peculiar orthography, characteristic of the Abruzzi region, is echoed in the badly mutilated N2, though their relationship cannot be deduced with more precision because of the unavailability of the latter. F is most notable for making significant alterations to the text, especially from chapter 34 (35B) to 50 (52B). It paraphrases some passages, usually with significant telescoping, and entirely omits others, such as most of the paragraph in chapter 34 (35B) beginning “Incontinenti” and the entire passage on chapter 50 (52B) regarding Saint Gaudiosus.

N1 is on the whole quite similar to P1, though it retains the introduction. It has some variants shared with later copies, which are not so much errors as autonomous interventions: reducing the longer phrase “la carne che restava che vendere non se poteva” to the shorter “la carne che restava ad vendere,” or adding “et nobile” to a description. Some of its notable characteristics are its long chapter titles, added after the text itself was copied but probably by the same copyist; its treatment of chapter 47 (49B), where it reorganizes and paraphrases parts of the narrative; and its variant in the first sentence of chapter 69A, such that it is not Saint Louis IX of France who is “much better than any other,” but his brother Charles I who “carried himself better than all others.” All these characteristics are echoed in the later copies SN2 and P3. However SN2 and P3 cannot be directly descended from N1, for the latter has a number of unique lacunae, such as the omission of a long phrase in chapter 47 (49B) and parts of two sentences in chapter 68A.

P2, as has been noted, is closely related to the earlier F but does not descend from it. All the idiosyncrasies mentioned in the thumbnail description of F are found in this copy too. P2 occasionally retains a majority reading where F offers a variant; P2 also commits errors not found in its predecessor, sometimes small ones (writing “mariti” for “morti” in chapter 50 [52B]), sometimes larger ones (for instance, a *saut* on “morti” resulting in the loss of sixteen words in the same chapter).

SN1 is an unusual copy. As noted above, it seems to represent an accumulation of errors and variants found in the earlier copies P1, F, N1, and P2. It also contains some unique errors, such as a *saut de même au même* in chapter 36 (37B) and the copying of the last passage of chapter 38 (39B) in the middle of the final phrase of the previous chapter. Most notably, it introduces some unique information to the text. At the end Chapter 30 (31B), it adds a legend that the first person to break Virgil's magic egg would die; at the end of chapter 45 (47B) it describes the church of S. Silvestro de lo Capo as a nunnery possessing the head of John the Baptist.<sup>94</sup> All these features suggest SN1's distance from the original. Yet this copy retains some passages lost from most or all other Group A copies that are very likely original. In two cases—a *saut* on “per ipso” in chapter 36 (37B), and a *saut* on “grandissime” in chapter 53 (55B)—SN1, along with one other Group A manuscript (V) and both Group B manuscripts, retains the missing words. Because the passages are nonsensical without the missing words and those words are retained in copies from both Group A and Group B, they must be original. In chapter 31 (32B), most manuscripts appear to commit a *saut* on “Chironte,” which some of these copies “correct” by adding an additional phrase elsewhere in the passage to restore grammaticality. SN1 offers what appears to be the full missing passage; V does as well, but with two scribal errors, while PL offers only the first part of the passage.<sup>95</sup> Finally, in chapter 41 (42B), SN1 is the only Group A manuscript to retain a passage where all others, including V, commit a *saut* on “Grecia.” (Both Group B manuscripts also retain the passage here.)<sup>96</sup> SN1 is therefore a good example of how complex the manuscript transmission of the *Cronaca* must have been, representing at once an accumulation of variants found in various combinations in other copies, unique variants of its own, and the rare retention of a few passages that are probably original.

---

<sup>94</sup> The end of chapter 72A also has an added comment noting that Queen Maria of Hungary built the monastery of Santa Maria Donnaregina; this, however, appears to have been added at a later moment by the hand that also added the chapter titles, and therefore is not noted in the apparatus to the edition.

<sup>95</sup> Unusually, E here does not follow PL, but accords with most Group A manuscripts.

<sup>96</sup> An ambiguous case occurs in chapter 58 (60B), where SN1 adds a comment at the end of the chapter noting that Robert Guiscard built the monastery of San Lorenzo in Aversa. PL alone also records this fact, which it notes in mid-chapter. Possibly the reading was original: it appears in PL immediately following mention of Robert's founding the cathedral of Aversa, such that the other copies could have committed a *saut* on “Aversa;” perhaps the SN1 copyist also committed this *saut* but corrected himself quickly, adding it instead at the end of the chapter.

V is even more idiosyncratic. Its narrative diverges from all other manuscript copies after chapter 56, which it copies twice, first in the usual continuous prose and then in list form. Roughly speaking, its contents thereafter correspond to those of other Group A manuscripts as follows:

Chapter division, Group A MSS	Chapter division, V
57–60	57V
61–beginning of 63	58V
rest of 63	59V–62V
64–65	63V
beginning of 66	64V
67	65V–66V
68	67V
69	68V
part of 72, plus one sentence from 73	69V

In addition to offering a different chapter division of this material, V so abbreviates, reorganizes, and paraphrases the standard Group A narrative as to constitute a thorough rewriting of it. Furthermore, as indicated in the chart above, it omits all of chapters 70–71A, and preserves only a fragment from chapter 72A, to which is appended a single sentence fragment from the middle of chapter 73A. V's copy of the *Cronaca* ends here in mid-sentence, at the bottom of fol. 22<sup>v</sup>, expl. "Questo dede la contessa de Nola per mogliere a misser Romano Ursino de." Because it is incomplete, it does not include the colophon identifying the *Cronaca*'s author and dedicatee. Even before its major rewriting of the work, V offers a number of unique scribal errors. But, as noted in the thumbnail portrait of SN<sub>1</sub>, V accords with SN<sub>1</sub> in retaining three passages lost to all other Group A witnesses that are likely original. Thus this copy, like SN<sub>1</sub>, cannot be completely dismissed as a witness to the original. In that light it is noteworthy that V sometimes accords very closely with our base manuscript, M<sub>1</sub>, for instance in its chapter titles and in small details such as retaining the adverb "là" in chapter 41 (42B).

As noted above, GC is on the whole very similar to M<sub>1</sub> and may descend directly from it. They share errors, including *sauts de même au même*, and include the same few chapter titles, whose text is usually identical in the two copies. Even their specific word order (variations of which are not included in the *apparatus criticus* because so numerous) are very commonly identical. GC includes almost none of the variants common to P<sub>1</sub>, F, N<sub>1</sub>, and P<sub>2</sub> and is useful in illustrating that those copies, some of which are early, did not have as wide an influence as might otherwise be

imagined. Apart from the variants it shares with M1 alone, GC's errors are usually unique to it, and are often the product of the copyist's (or his exemplar's) poor understanding of the text. Latin phrases are badly garbled, and many vernacular words and phrases are misunderstood and miscopied in a way that renders them nonsensical. The copyist also has an unusual "dyslexic" tendency, reversing words and phrases in a way that diminishes their sense. For instance in chapter 44 (46B), instead of "miraculo lo quale advenne ad una dompna," it reads "miraculo advenne lo quali ad una dopna." Again in the same chapter, what was probably "lo predicto" becomes "per lo dicto," adding an unnecessary preposition; in the following chapter, "poy non troppo grande tempo" becomes "poi non troppo tempo grande." Its errors and divergences from M1 increase as the chapters proceed.

As noted above, SN2 and P3 are extremely similar: P3 introduces a few more, minor errors, but otherwise follows SN2 virtually exactly. Their noteworthy relationship to (but not descent from) N1 has been discussed in the thumbnail description of the latter, and suggests they may have a common ancestor; they also share variant readings with other, earlier manuscripts, in no particular pattern.

### *Conclusion*

The conclusions to be drawn from this description of manuscripts are as follows. M1, hitherto unknown to students of the *Cronaca*, has the best claim to serve as a base manuscript for a critical edition. It is the third earliest copy, and is clearly superior to its two predecessors, PL and P1. It also has the smallest number of unique errors and idiosyncrasies. P1 and N1 move in and out of agreement with each other and with M1, each superior to the others in certain readings and each with its own idiosyncrasies or omissions, which are most numerous in N1. F is the earliest manuscript to exhibit extensive rewriting of certain passages, above all in the middle chapters of the work, in which rewriting it is followed by P2. SN1 has, on the one hand, a number of affinities with its predecessors P1, F, N1, and P2. It also has a number of idiosyncrasies of its own. But it retains certain original passages that most other manuscripts do not. V also retains most of these original passages lost to other Group A manuscripts, but is even more idiosyncratic, containing a fairly large number of scribal errors and, most importantly, representing a unique truncation and paraphrase of the text from the end of chapter 56 forward.

GC, though a late witness, is generally very close to M<sub>1</sub>, and does not display the variants common to the other witnesses. But its copyist was inattentive, and as the chapters proceed its errors accumulate. SN<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub> share some distinctive characteristics with N<sub>1</sub>, and probably relate to it through a common ancestor; similarly, they display (with or without N<sub>1</sub>) affinities with F-P<sub>2</sub>, but are not descended directly from either. P<sub>3</sub> appears to be a direct descendant of SN<sub>2</sub>, introducing a few more variants but on the whole extremely similar to it.

As for the Group B manuscripts (PL and E), they represent a significant redaction of the original text, especially but not exclusively from chapter 60 (62B) forward, where they often substitute narration drawn from the “Southernized Villani” in place of the original *Cronaca*’s account. In many instances E, though later, is closer to the Group A version of the text; at the same time, it displays a rather high number of scribal errors. PL, though it vies with P<sub>1</sub> for the status of earliest extant copy, not only displays the major alterations of the redacted version but offers its own, unique paraphrase or word substitution in many cases, as well as some unique additions and omissions. Despite their clear distance from the original *Cronaca*, PL and E remain useful for reconstituting that original. In one case they alone retain a passage lost to all Group A manuscripts but found in the known source-text. In several other cases their witness combines with that of one or two Group A manuscripts to reconstitute a passage lost in most copies through a *saut de même au même*.

chart 1  
group a manuscript: overa ll contents

P1 (c. 1400)	M1 (c. 1438)	F (1440s)	N2 (1451)	V (1450–1500)	N1 (1471)	P2 (1479)	SN1 (1497–1504)	GC (1516)	SN2 (c. 1568)	P3 (c. 1600)
[Tract. fidei]										
Clement IV bull	Clement IV bull									
"De romano imperatore" "De romano imperatore"										
Prelate list										
Cronaca	Cronaca	Cronaca	Cronaca +*	Cronaca*	Cronaca	Cronaca	Cronaca	Cronaca	Cronaca	Cronaca
SV*	SV	SV	SV+	SV	SV	SV	SV	SV	SV	SV
UV	UV	UV	UV	UV	UV*	UV	UV#	UV#	UV*	UV*
Sito ... Campania	Sito ... Campania	Sito ... Campania	Sito ... Campania	Sito ... Camp.#	Sito ... Camp.	Sito ... Campania	Sito ... Campania	Sito ... Campania	Sito ... Camp.	Sito ... Camp.
Israel kings	Isr. kings	Isr. kings	Isr. kings	Isr. kings	Isr. kings	Isr. kings	Isr. kings	Isr. kings	Isr. kings	Isr. kings
2 poems	2 poems	2 poems	2 poems+	different poems	2 poems	2 poems	2 poems	First of 2 poems	2 poems	2 poems
Trattato	Trattato	Trattato	Trattato	Martin of Troppau#	Trattato	Trattato*	Trattato	Trattato	Trattato	Trattato
Petrarch	Petrarch*	Petrarch	Petrarch	Petrarch	Petrarch	Petrarch	Petrarch	Petrarch	Petrarch	Petrarch
Gesta episc. Neap.*	[Cicero]									
[Aristotle]										
Kings to 1503										

\* = incomplete at end; + = incomplete at start; # = contents out of order; [] = added to MS at later moment

THE CRONACA DI PARTENOPE  
A CRITICAL EDITION





## PREFACE TO THE EDITION

As discussed in Chapter Six above, M<sub>1</sub> has been chosen as the base manuscript for several reasons. It is an early copy of the original version of the text: only P<sub>1</sub> is earlier. Compared to P<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>1</sub> is superior in retaining a number of important passages omitted by its predecessor, and by including fewer errors. While M<sub>1</sub> commits some simple and easily correctible scribal errors, often involving a single letter, and some *sauts de même au même* common to other copies, its only unique addition is to copy a phrase in chapter 19 (20B) twice, and its only unique omission that of six words in chapter 60 (62B). Overall, therefore, I find it by far the best candidate to serve as the base text.

The variants of all available witnesses are included in the apparatus: PL, P<sub>1</sub>, F, V, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, E, SN<sub>1</sub>, GC, SN<sub>2</sub>, and P<sub>3</sub>. Occasionally in the first 59 chapters, and extensively thereafter, Group B manuscripts offer a notably different version than Group A manuscripts. Where these variant passages are short, they are noted in the apparatus. Where I find them too extensive to be comfortably included in the apparatus, I offer the A and B versions in parallel columns, with PL serving as the base manuscript for version B and E's variants noted in the apparatus. I do not include variants of a third Group B manuscript, VZ. As noted in Chapter Six, only four chapters of it survive in the nineteenth-century transcription of Vincenzo di Giovanni, who offered the variants of PL in footnotes. My consultation of PL indicates that di Giovanni sometimes failed to note variants between his copy and PL, and sometimes gave PL's readings incorrectly.<sup>1</sup> For these reasons I do not have confidence in the reliability of his transcription of VZ, and omit it from the edition.

Sometimes the B version of the text includes a passage absent from the original, in which case that passage is offered on the right half of the page, marked "B" in the margin; the left half of the page, representing the

---

<sup>1</sup> In chapter 73B, for instance, where VZ offers "conte" (de Provenza) and PL reads "duca," di Giovanni did not note the variant. In the same chapter 73B, di Giovanni gives VZ's reading of a Provençal family name as "Cancellini" and PL's reading in the note as "Cantelini." In fact PL reads "Cantelmi," the correct name of this family; VZ therefore might well have read "Cancellmi," or even "Cantelmi" given the great similarity between "t" and "c" in some hands. See Vincenzo di Giovanni, "Di un altro codice della Cronica di Napoli di Giovanni Villani," *Propugnatore* 9 (1876), 174–187.

A version, remains blank. When a passage occurs only in the A version, similarly, the text appears only on the left half of the page, the right (B) column remaining blank. This convention may be confusing in one instance: that involving the Cronaca's citation of verses from the *Aeneid*. These verses, along with several introductory lines, appear in chapter 2 in the A version; the verses appear in chapter 3, however, in the B version. Thus the reader will find them on the left half of the page in chapter 2, and on the right half of the page in chapter 3. No manuscript, of course, copied the verses twice.

I do not include in the edition the text of the eighteen chapters, unique to the B version, where Group B's text derives, via the "Southernized Villani," from Giovanni Villani's *Nuova Cronica*. The relevant chapters from Villani's work are indicated, and the reader can consult the text in an edition of Villani's work. Titles, incipits, explicits, and (where appropriate) short comments on these chapters are provided in Appendix I.

Manuscript V differs very substantially from all other witnesses from the end of chapter 56 (58B) forward. Unlike the Group B manuscripts, V's different version had no "afterlife," and therefore does not merit parallel text in the edition itself. For those interested in its readings, the text of V from the end of chapter 56 forward is provided in Appendix II.

Finally, the first and last folios of manuscript PL are badly mutilated. A later hand recopied the first folio on an additional leaf at the front of the codex, sometimes providing readings lost to the original. I have not followed these reconstituted readings, which clearly represent the later copyist's best guess and are sometimes in error. Where the original folio's readings are lost, either because of a hole in the parchment or the severe fading of the ink, I have noted the missing words in the apparatus, denoted with the words *lacuna*, *illeg.*, or both. However if the beginning of the first missing word and the end of the last are legible, and (if more than two words are missing) the space missing is appropriate to the missing words, I have assumed a correct reading and do not note the lacuna. For instance, in chapter 2, where M1 reads "fortellecze nello piu" and PL reads "fortell- ... -u" around a hole in the parchment whose size corresponds to the missing letters, I assume a good reading and do not note the lacuna. On PL's final folio, where parts of some lines are lost, I provide the missing words, in brackets, from manuscript E. Where manuscript E, which ends earlier than PL, has no reading, I resort to the first edition, which was certainly based on a Group B text.

*Presentation of the Main Text*

The Neapolitan idiom employed in the base manuscript is rather easily understood by a reader of modern Italian. For ease of reference through this long work, however, I have provided brief English-language summaries, in italics, at the start of each chapter. The line numeration of the edition includes the lines devoted to these summaries, but the summaries are not, of course, original to the text. The numeration of the chapters themselves is also an editorial intervention. The division of the text into chapters reflects that of the base manuscript, but M<sub>1</sub> did not number its chapters. Other copies did number the chapters, though often with errors. Line numeration of the edition includes these chapter numbers just as it includes the English-language summaries. This permits me to comment, in the apparatus, on variants related to chapter division and chapter titles in the various manuscript copies.

Regarding the text itself, my goal has been to preserve the flavor of a single manuscript witness as much as possible without sacrificing comprehensibility. Thus I have not corrected inconsistencies of spelling in the base manuscript. The same word is often spelled differently in different passages even in this single copy; plural articles often accompany singular nouns (and vice versa), and agreement in gender, by the standards of modern Italian, is often violated. Other copies demonstrate that this was not at all unusual in the centuries in which these manuscripts were made. While such variety can lead to confusion—for instance, whether a noun should be considered singular or plural—this was a confusion shared by our copyists and integral to the reception and transmission of the text. I also leave M<sub>1</sub> uncorrected in cases where its reading is sensible but probably further from the original. In chapter 31 (32B), for instance, it is very likely that M<sub>1</sub>, like most copies, commits a *saut de même au même* on the word *Chironte*, where PL, V, and SN<sub>1</sub> display part or all of what was probably the original phrase. M<sub>1</sub>'s reading still makes sense, however, and is therefore followed in the main text. Regarding chapter titles, those found in M<sub>1</sub> are included in the main text, with the variants found in other copies that also include those titles offered in the apparatus. Where M<sub>1</sub> offers no title, however, I do not offer one in the main text on the basis of other copies. The note to the chapter number indicates which manuscripts added a chapter title, but those added titles themselves are given instead in Appendix III.

The editorial interventions made to the base text are as follows. First, I have employed modern Italian conventions of capitalization: at the

beginning of sentences and direct quotations, for the first word of book titles, and for proper names. I do not capitalize titles such as *imperator* or *papa*, and capitalize *sancto* when it is part of the proper name of a church or monastery, but not when it describes a person (in which cases I treat it as an adjective). In keeping with modern Italian, cities and regions are capitalized but the denizens of those cities and regions are not: *Roma*, but *romani*.

Second, I have added punctuation where it makes most sense in the flow of the base manuscript. Other witnesses' variants, especially regarding conjunctions and prepositions, and their graphic indicators (word spacing, larger initials, and vertical or diagonal lines) suggest that different copyists broke up the text differently, and the lack of clear or standardized punctuation is surely an important factor in the overall variation from copy to copy. To omit all punctuation from the edition, however, would constitute an unnecessary obstacle to comprehension.

Third, I have added modern accent marks to those words whose meaning would otherwise be unclear. Accents are useful to distinguish "and" from "is" (*e/è*), "of" from "day" (*di/dì*), and the first-person present from the third-person perfect (*porto/portò*). In most cases, however, the meaning is sufficiently clear without accents, for instance with regard to "city" (*cita*) or "thus" (*così, cusi*, etc), and I do not add them.

Fourth, I have extended common abbreviations, such as a straight horizontal line for "m" or "n", in keeping with the general spelling of M1 (in the main text) and of the other copies (in the apparatus). In all but the latest manuscript copies, *Iesu* and *cristo* are always abbreviated, usually as *Ihu* and *xpo* (sometimes, for the latter, *x<sup>o</sup>*). Since the extended spelling these copyists might have used is never attested, I have retained the abbreviated form.

The fifth area involves word elision. Copyists often ran words together. Whether they intended elision or merely wrote the words so closely that they appear elided is often difficult to determine. In general I have broken up what appear to be long elisions (e.g., *indelaquale*), for ease of reading and because meaning is not affected. In other cases, however, elision could well obstruct understanding, for instance of the distinction between *luna* ("moon") and *l'una* ("the one"), between *ove* ("where") and *ovè* ("where is"), or between *sencza* ("without") and *se'ncze* (an elided reflexive and preposition). Confusion of homonyms is also possible where the second term in the elision starts with a consonant, in which cases I provide a punctus to indicate the proper word separation, for instance *co.lloro* ("with them") versus *coloro* ("them"). In many cases the

meaning may well be understandable without denoting the elision, but in this matter, for consistency's sake, I supply the apostrophe or punctus in all cases where it applies: thus *Castel dell'Ovo*, *San Iohanne a. Llaterano*, *l'una et l'altra*.

Finally, in the few cases where M1 is in error and the error renders the passage nonsensical, I have corrected it in the main text and offered M1's variant reading in the note. Most of these involve a single word on which M1 has committed a scribal error, for instance offering *secundo fece lege* instead of the more correct *secundo se lege* in chapter 31 (32B), or *xpo san Pietro* for the correct *xpo sempiterno* in chapter 35 (36B). There are several cases, however, where M1, like most copies, commits a *saut de même au même* that renders the passage incomprehensible. In these cases I have supplied the missing words in the main text, in brackets, and have indicated in the apparatus which manuscript copy was utilized for the spelling of the bracketed words.

In a number of passages the grammar of M1 is faulty, and most or all other witnesses accord with M1 in the fault. Especially in long sentences with multiple subordinate clauses, "the end doth forget the beginning": the verb may be repeated, or the grammar changed midstream. For instance, the first sentence of chapter 56 (58B) reads, "Next it should be known that the kingdom of Sicily, before it was united and entirely made one and entitled a kingdom, there were various dominions and lords." Grammatically, one should either add a preposition to the first clause (*in* the kingdom of Sicily) or change the final verb from *erance* ("there were") to *habe* ("had"). A different problem arises in chapter 52 (54B). It reads, "And since mention has been made of saint Athanasius, whose good works should not be left untold, that in the church of San Gennaro . . ." Here the phrase *non è da tacere*, offered only once, demands repeating; both Athanasius' good works, and what he did in San Gennaro, should not be left untold. Because such errors are shared by most or all witnesses, and the meaning is fairly easily reconstructed by the reader, I have not corrected them. There is one case, however—the first sentence of chapter 7—where the end of the sentence again forgets the beginning, with the result that no verb is supplied at all. I have found myself reading this passage over and over in an attempt to make grammatical sense of it. I suspect readers of this edition would do the same, and to avoid this distraction I have provided the missing verb, *fece*, in square brackets in the main text, despite the fact that no surviving manuscript witness offers it.

*Extent of the Apparatus*

The thorniest issue in editing the *Cronaca* is deciding upon the appropriate extent of the apparatus. Because there was no standard spelling or grammar for Neapolitan in these centuries, each copyist employed his own conventions; indeed, as noted above, different spellings of the same word are frequently found in a single copy. Such differences are doubtless of interest to those concerned with the development of Neapolitan as a written language, but to annotate them all, for twelve witnesses, would be tantamount to reproducing every manuscript in full. The apparatus of the present edition records both scribal errors and variant readings, but not differences of spelling, grammar, or word order that leave meaning unaffected. There are, of course, numerous cases where the distinction between variants that are meaningful and those that are not is quite murky. For those who may wish to compare the edition with one or more manuscript copies, the following explanation of such cases and my decisions about them may be of use.

Spelling. In many cases this is uncontroversial: *cosi*, *cosci*, *cosci*, *cussi*, and *куси*, or *lo*, *lu*, and *il* are all attested, and all clearly indicate the same word. Certain phrases are also rendered in different forms that I treat as equivalent: *o* and *overo* (“or”), *habenga Dio che*, *advenga dio*, *advenne che*, and similar phrases (“it happened that”). In other cases the synonymy is less obvious. *Impercio*, *impercio che*, *impero che*, *pero che*, and *pero* are all attested. Although *però* in modern Italian has a different meaning (“but”), it is clear that in these manuscripts it carries the same meaning as the other forms, “because.” Similarly, the forms *insiò/insuta*, attested in earlier copies, and *uscìò/uscita*, found in later copies, all carry the same meaning of “exited” or “exit.” Finally, in the conjugation of the third person plural, some copyists write the ending *-anno* as *-ando*, making the word appear to be a gerund (*stanno/stando*). This spelling variant is also found in other words where no ambiguity of meaning is involved, e.g. *advende* for *advenne*. Where the grammar of the passage, and other witnesses, indicate that the third person plural was intended, I treat the added “d” as a spelling variant and do not note it in the apparatus.

The differences between masculine and feminine and between singular and plural. These can be vexing, for even a single copyist often preceded a noun with a feminine article in one case and a masculine article in the next, or spelled a noun with a singular ending in one instance and a plural ending, clearly referring to the same noun, in the next. I neither “correct” these variations in the base manuscript nor note variants from

other witnesses. Variation, however, can extend to different interpretations of the meaning. Though *le loro habitaciune* and *lle loro habitacioni* can both be interpreted as plural thanks to the definite article, readings with no article (*loro habitacione*) could be interpreted as singular, and one witness reads *loco et habitacione*, clearly an error but one which suggests *habitacione* should be understood as singular. Certainly a translator must decide between “their home” and “their homes,” and where I translate a passage in my discussion I choose the form that makes most sense in context. Because such variations are innumerable, it is not feasible to note them all in the apparatus. Where meaning is materially affected, I still offer M1’s reading in the main text, but do note the variant in the apparatus. This is the case in chapter 50 (52B), where M1 writes of Charlemagne and of Desiderius and Adelgis *suoy figlioli*, as if Desiderius and Adelgis were both Charlemagne’s sons. The historically correct reading would be *suo figliolo*, such that Adelgis is simply Desiderius’ son, and some witnesses have this reading. The correct interpretations of such passages are discussed in Appendix I.

Presence or absence of the definite article or possessive adjective. Thus *dalle loro nave*, *dalloro nave*, and *dalle navi* are treated as equivalent, as are *la testa* and *sua testa*. Again, the change in meaning is very slight, and the instances of such variation too numerous to be feasibly included in the apparatus.

The reflexive *si/se*. This is treated as optional by the copyists, and its presence or absence is not noted. However, where *si/se* indicates “if,” or serves as an emphatic (denoted with an accent, *si*), its presence or absence is noted.

Variation in or absence of preposition where meaning is equivalent. Thus “in the time of” versus “at the time of” (*nelo/alo*) is not noted, nor is the description of an army passing *per la via* or *della via*. The presence of *ad/a* is treated as optional by many copyists, as is *ne/nce/vi/gi/ze* (all of which are equivalent). *Di/de* and *da*, though bearing distinct meanings in modern Italian, are also treated as equivalent by these copyists and variants are therefore not noted. The reader should supply the meaning (of/from) which is most logical. If the preposition clearly denotes a different meaning (for instance, *sopra* versus *socto*), or if the addition or omission of a preposition affects the meaning or legibility of the phrase, the variant is noted.

The conjunction *et/e*. Copyists include or omit this conjunction at will. Although variation here sometimes suggests a different phrasing, it very rarely affects meaning in any significant way and is only noted in the very



rare cases where the difference in meaning of the surrounding passage is significant.<sup>2</sup>

The adjective “aforesaid” (*dicto/predicto/sopradicto*). This is treated as optional by many copyists and does not affect meaning. Some copies occasionally retain the adjective but omit the noun, e.g. *lo predicto* in the place of *lo predicto ovo*. Though the intended antecedent is usually clear, in these cases I do note the absence of the noun.

There remain cases where apparently minor variations in spelling, word division, and preposition combine, and shade slowly into error. A good example occurs in chapter 15. M<sub>1</sub> reads, *et e ovidio undi colloro*. Context makes clear that *undi* represents two words: in modern Italian the phrase would be rendered *et è Ovidio un* (or *uno*) *di coloro* (“and Ovid is one of them”). Because word separation is often unclear in medieval manuscripts, there is no reason to treat *undi* as an error. It is evident, however, that many copyists followed an exemplar that, like M<sub>1</sub>, compressed these two words, creating ever greater confusion. *Undi* easily became *unde*, “whence” (P<sub>1</sub>), or the Italianized *onde* (N<sub>1</sub>, V); *colloro*, a simple noun, may have been mistaken for an elided preposition and noun (*con + loro*), for it became, perhaps in an effort to recover meaning in the passage, a different elision, *chelloro* (= *che loro*) in N<sub>1</sub>. In an apparent attempt to improve the sentence’s meaning, N<sub>1</sub> simultaneously omitted the *e* before Ovid’s name, perhaps interpreting it as an errant repetition of *et*. In terms of the critical apparatus, should *unde* and *onde* be treated as variant spellings of *undi*—that is, *un di*—or as errors? Even if *onde* is fairly clearly an error, the copyist who wrote *unde* could easily have meant “one of,” in which case it would constitute a good reading. Since a choice must be made regarding which readings represent significant variants, my general rule is to include in the apparatus only those which are clearly erroneous, and assume a “good” reading wherever it is possible to do so. Where the reading is clearly in error—for instance, manuscript V gives *oscura* as *o | scura*, with the vertical line asserting word division, in chapter 16—I have noted it. It should also be kept in mind, however, that sometimes a noted variant is not necessarily in error. In chapter 47, where M<sub>1</sub> has *loquale stava depresso la corte*, P<sub>1</sub> lacks the verb *stava*, but the phrase makes equal sense if *loquale* is interpreted instead as *loqualè*. I

---

<sup>2</sup> One such case is in chapter 34 (35B), where some copies read that Saint Peter asked *de lo stato et de li citadini* (“about the state and about the citizens”), while other copies read *de lo stato de li citadini* (“about the condition of the citizens”). Here the presence or absence of the conjunction affects the meaning and proper translation of the phrase.

note the omission of *stava* in P1, but the reader interested in such variants may observe that P1's reading can be considered equally correct from a grammatical point of view.

Verb endings. Where the same tense is intended, I do not note variants, e.g. *perero* and *perereno* (i.e. chapter 11), *foro* and *forono*, *iudicasseno* and *iudicassero* (chapter 12), *assaltò* (written, of course, without the accent) and *assaltao*. Variations between imperfect and perfect (such as *aviano* versus *ebero*) are again too numerous and inconsequential to the meaning to merit notice, as are the different forms of "died" (*è morto, fu morto, moriò, morite*).<sup>3</sup> The difference between present and past tense, however, can be significant, in illustrating whether the copyist considered the described condition (for instance, the efficacy of one of Virgil's magic spells) to be ongoing or finished. These sometimes present a challenge. For instance, if *habitano* is clearly present tense and *habitavano* clearly the imperfect, what of *habitanno*? There do not appear to be clear patterns. At the end of chapter 14, where M1 has *habitanno*, N1 gives the present, *habitano*. However in Chapter 13, where M1 again gives the ambiguous *examinanno*, N1 instead gives the imperfect: *examinavano*. The last line of chapter 47 (49B) presents an equally difficult case. M1 gives *passara*, apparently a future tense, although the meaning of the sentence demands a conditional. Other copies give *passaro*, either a scribal error or a past perfect, while others give *passaria/passariano*, that is, a singular or plural conditional. In such uncertain cases I have erred on the side of thoroughness, despite the greater encumbrance to the apparatus, because a copyist's sense of an action or condition as finished or ongoing, factual or hypothetical, seems to me sufficiently significant to merit attention. As these examples illustrate, however, the reader should be careful in assigning great importance to verb tenses, not only because they were so easily changed from one copy to another but because even in a single manuscript the copyist's meaning can be unclear.

Reversed word order. In general this is not noted, because it is very common and irrelevant to the meaning. *Non potesse soccorrere* and *soccorrere non potesse* are treated as equivalent; so are *visitare et fare reverentia et assistere* versus *assistere et visitare et fare reverentia*. Fairly frequently a dependent clause will appear at the beginning of a sentence in one witness and at the end in another, without altering the meaning: a reader

---

<sup>3</sup> However, where the variant involves other words and may indicate a scribal error, I do note it, e.g. the difference between *foy morto* and *poy moriò*.

comparing the edition to any given manuscript copy is urged to read a bit further on in the manuscript before assuming that a variant addition or omission has been overlooked. Only in cases where the placement of a phrase relates it to a different clause, thus significantly changing the meaning, is the different placement noted in the apparatus, usually with the phrase *pos. post* (“placed after”) followed by the word in the main text after which the phrase is found in the variant copy.

Proper names. Like other words, proper names are subject to considerable variation in spelling. Where the variant appears to me recognizable as the same word as the base manuscript, I do not note it; where the difference is considerable, I do. Thus *Lacedemonia* and *Lacedonia* (chapter 1), *Venus* and *Venere* (chapter 16), *Pietro*, *Petro*, and even *Pero* (chapter 47 [49B]) are treated as equivalent, but *Aluno* or *Allimo* for *Albino* (chapter 14), or *Vincentio* or *Eutice* for *Uticero* (chapter 44 [46B]) are noted in the apparatus. As throughout, my aim is to limit an already extensive apparatus while calling attention to potentially significant change in meaning. In most of these cases the issue is the familiarity or unfamiliarity of toponyms and personal names; in others, such as SN2’s and P3’s consistent replacement of *Vulgaria* with *Ungaria* in chapters 59 (61B) and 60 (62B), a recognizable but different meaning has been applied to the passage. At times the proper name offered in the manuscripts does not correspond to its modern equivalent. For instance, the Adriatic sea is never rendered as *mare adriatico*, but most often as *mare adriano*. Where the reader may not recognize the intended place or person I provide the modern equivalent in the historical notes, but do not correct the base manuscript or note minor variants (for instance, *mare andriano*).

Chapter titles. M1 offers titles for some (but not all) chapters, and I have retained these titles in the main text as integral to this copy. Where M1 has a chapter title, I give the variant readings of other copies in the apparatus, and note which copies omit a title. Where M1 does not have a chapter title but other copies do, I provide a note to the chapter number indicating which copies added a title, but for considerations of space I give those other copies’ titles in Appendix III rather than in the apparatus. Chapter titles in N1 are rubricated and were clearly added after the main text was copied, since they sometimes run into the margin for lack of space. The hand, however, appears to me to be that of the principal copyist. This identity is also suggested by the fact that the title of chapter 24 (25B) was mistakenly copied (in brown ink) at the end of the previous chapter, but copied again, with the exact same wording, as the rubric for chapter 24. N1’s chapter titles are therefore considered

original. The chapter titles of SN<sub>1</sub>, however, appear to me to have been added by a different hand; therefore they do not appear in the apparatus or in Appendix III.

Additions and corrections to the text by the principal copyist and by later hands. Sometimes the principal copyist has corrected his own mistake. N<sub>1</sub>, for instance, writes *Cecilia Lucia* in chapter 47 (49B), where *Cecilia* has been underlined to indicate it is an error. In such cases I note only the corrected reading. Where the principal copyist has corrected a lacuna by copying the missing words in the margin, I note the correction and its placement. Thus chapter 19 (20B), in the following edition, contains a note “et la piazza de Nido un cavallo di colo nigro senza freno *add. in marg. inferior PL.*” In general I wish to omit notation of interventions by later hands. Thus where a later hand added a datum to the end of chapter 72A in manuscript SN<sub>1</sub>, I do not note it. Similarly, where the principal copyist of SN<sub>1</sub> conflated several chapters and a later hand noted chapter division by adding capital letters (A], B]) at certain points in the text with corresponding titles in the margin, I do not note the intervention. Finally, as noted in the last paragraph, I do not note the chapter titles added by a later hand to this copy. There are a few uncertain cases. For instance, in SN<sub>1</sub> at chapter 57 (59B), the date missing from the main text has been provided just above the line as “995 ov[ero] 1055.” The principal copyist sometimes uses Arabic numerals, and the shape of the numerals here appears similar to those used elsewhere, but there are too few characters here to be certain the intervention was original. Since it is possible, I have included the correction with the indication *pos. super lineam* (“placed above the line”). Finally, there are cases, especially numerous in manuscript GC, where a later hand has written over the text to correct it, partially or wholly obscuring the original reading. Where I cannot make out the original reading, I note it as *illeg.* (“illegible”). This notation is also sometimes necessary for manuscript SN<sub>1</sub> where the ink is too faint, even when magnified, to be made out. Where I can partially decipher the original reading, I offer the partial or uncertain reading in the apparatus, followed by a question mark.

### *Interpreting the Apparatus*

The apparatus follows the line sequence of the main text, with variants identified by the line(s) in which they appear. If a line of text contains multiple words or phrases subject to variation (for instance, on line 3 both

*quando* and *sopra* have variants), the notations for *quando* and *sopra* are separated by a double vertical line. For each notation, the word or phrase subject to variation is given in regular type before a bracket, followed by the variant in regular type and the copy containing the variant in italics. Thus “quando] quanto GC” means that M1’s reading *quando* appears in manuscript GC as *quanto*. *Add.* (*additur, adduntur*) means that the variant word(s) appear after the base word in the identified manuscript(s); *om.* (*omittitur, omittuntur*) means that the base word(s) are omitted; *repet.* means that the base words are accidentally repeated. Where multiple copies have the same variant, the spelling of the variant offered in the note comes from the first attested variant copy. Thus in “ad ipso ... Johanne] ogni soa divocione PL, E” the spelling of “ogni soa divocione” reflects PL. Multiple variants around the same word or phrase are combined in a single notation. For instance, in chapter 50 (52B), the note “castella] om. N1, P3, altre terre P2, de fore cio è deli add. GC” means that the base manuscript’s word *castella* is omitted in N1 and P3, is replaced by the alternate phrase *altre terre* in P2, and appears but with the words *de fore cio è deli* added after it in GC. Where different kinds of variants end on the same word, however, they are noted separately. Again in chapter 50 (52B), two manuscripts provide variant readings to the phrase “lo quale corpo de lo quale Aldegessio.” A third manuscript, however, simply omits the word “Aldegessio.”

Where M1 is clearly in error, the correct reading is given in the main text, and its source is given before the bracket. Thus the notation “des (P1)] soy M1” means that the proper reading I give in the main text, *des*, comes from P1, and that M1 here reads *soy*. Often multiple manuscripts will offer the correct reading: the reader will know which other witnesses have the correct reading because they are not indicated in the note. The drawback of correcting M1 for these readings is that the spelling of the correction reflects a different copy. There are few such corrections, and they usually involve only a single word; still, I have tried to supply the corrected text from another early Group A copy wherever possible, such that the different spelling conventions of the corrected text are relatively near those of M1. Where this is not possible, I have resorted to later Group A copies, which tend to conform more closely to modern Italian than M1. Only when no Group A copy has the correct reading do I resort to PL, whose “hyper-Tuscanized” spelling is quite distinctive.

In a few cases, multiple witnesses offer a long variant reading and have slight differences between them. In the interests of space, I do not copy out the entire variant reading for each variant witness separately in the

apparatus, but identify the slight differences between them via brackets. For instance, in chapter 34 (35B), the note to *langore* reads, “Et subito la dicta Candida fo liberata de omne [omne: la dicta P2] infirmita F, P2.” This indicates that manuscripts F and P2 are almost identical, but where F reads *omne*, P2 reads *la dicta*. Finally, where a manuscript witness combines two chapters, I note it at the beginning of the second chapter. For instance at chapter 38 (39B), the chapter number bears a note reading “cap. 37 (38B) et 38 (39B) uniti SN2, P3” because manuscripts SN2 and P3 treat these two chapters as one.



## EDITION

De la cita de Napoli la quale inter l'altre citate delo mundo per multitudine de cavaliere et di.lloro dilecte et ponpose ricchicze avea acquistata fama grandissima le quale cose se innarrano tucte in diversi volume de libre sicche in queste presente croniche tucte so conposte.

1

5

*Greeks from Calcis and Euboea, not wishing to be subject to the laws of Solon and Draco, sailed to Aenaria in the Bay of Naples. Finding it unsuitable, they crossed to the mainland and named their new settlement Cumae.*

Et primo de la sua origine et principio et de la inposicione delo nomo. In 10  
nello tempo de Solone filosofo de Athene et Dragone de Lacedonia,  
facturi de le lige de greci l'uno in Athene et l'altro in Lacedonia, com-  
posseno le legi ad cio che tucta Grecia potesseno soctomectere ale ligi. Li  
populi et gentili homine et signyure de la cita de Euboya de la provincia  
de Calcidia, indignandose de essereno constricti ad tale lege, determina- 15  
reno de se volereno partire da.lloro patria et trovare habitacione in altra  
parte et cossi fo facto et con grande copia de nave portati discurrendo  
per diverse marine et litora de Grecia et per diverse et grande tenpestate

---

1 De la] *om. V*, La *N1*, *SN2*, *P3*, *E*, Coroniche tanto de la nobillesema *GC* 1–4 De la cita ... conposte] *om. P1*, *F*, *P2*, *SN1* 1 citate] *om. N1*, *SN2*, *P3* || mundo] *lacuna PL* 2 dilecte et ponpose] populi et *E* || avea] have *V*, *N1*, *GC*, *SN2*, *P3*, *E* 3 le quale cose] quanto de altre notabele cose li quale *GC* || innarrano] narraranno *V* 3–4 de libre] e coroniche *PL*, *E* 4 sicche] et *PL*, *E*, sancti che *N1*, *om. GC* || croniche] scriptura *PL*, *E* || tucte] *om. PL*, *N1*, *SN2*, *P3*, brevemente *E* || so conposte] si compono *PL*, *E*, se innarrano *N1*, se porra sapere *SN2*, *P3*, et li presente sono copiate et scripte ad instantia de notaro Antonio Gambardella de Napoli et ad soa complacentia desideruso de legere et intendere *add. GC* 10 et] poy che *SN1* || inposicione] compositione *GC* 11 Dragone] de Agone *F*, *P2* 12 facturi ... Lacedonia] *om. V* || de greci] de Grecia *SN2*, *P3*, *lacuna PL* 12–13 l'uno ... Grecia] *om. P2* || composseno ... legi] *lacuna et illeg. PL* 13 soctomectere ale] *lacuna PL* 14 gentili] gioveni *V* || cita de Euboya] *lacuna et illeg. PL* 15 indignandose] isognandosi *E*, indigandosi *P3* || indignandose ... constricti] *illeg. PL* 16 de se ... partire] *illeg. PL* || volereno] *om. E*, *N1*, *SN2*, *P3* || et] andare a? *add. PL* 17 fo facto] fecero *N1*, *SN2*, *P3* || et con] de *GC* || con ... nave] *illeg. PL* || grande] compagnia et *add. E* || portati] partiti *V*, *GC*, *om. F*, *P2*, *SN1* 18 marine ... Grecia] *illeg. PL* || marine ... diverse] *om. E* || litora] liti *P2*, *SN1* || Grecia (*P1*)] Greci *M1* || et per] dove hebbero *SN2*, *P3* || per diverse et] con *F*, *P2*, *SN1*



de mare pervennero in Ytalia secundo che actesta Titolivio allo VIII libro  
 de Urbe condita. Et Ovidio, de Metemorfoseos, che indela insula Phita-  
 gusas et Sanaria si deseseno et si dice per suo verso, Colles Phitacusas  
 habitancium nomine dictas. La quale insula de poy che li dicte populi,  
 gentili homine, et signiure cum prudencia ci trovarono non essere conde- 5  
 gnyta et sufficiente ad issi de potereno capere et avere habitacione habero  
 intra lloro maturo consiglio et si peterono le marine de Cume le quale  
 ancora non se chiamavano Cume. Dissiendendo dunque dalle loro nave  
 nela marina trovareno una dompna dormire laquale era pregnyta et exte-  
 mareno dovere essere bonissimo augurio et de gran multiplicacione de 10  
 gente et per questo possino nomo ala citate laquale deveano hedificare  
 Cuma inpercio che Cuma in greco in latino è dicto dormire.

## 2

*The Greeks built the fortress and city of Cumae. After many years Daedalus  
 arrived. [A: he built a temple on Cumae's heights, as Virgil attests.]* 15

Poi che desese forono da.lloro nave et congregati in uno feceno consiglio  
 in quale luoco de la marina devessero la cita hedificare et quale edificio  
 devessero primo dessernere. Et fo determinato cossi che primo se dovesse  
 hedificare una fortellecze nello piu alto luoco de la marina, et socto la  
 dicta fortellecze se dovesse hedificare la cita. Laquale in successione de 20  
 tempo fo hedificata nobelemente et magnificata con grande palaczi al piu

1 de mare ... Ytalia] *illeg. usque ad* "-lia" *PL* || actesta ... libro] *illeg. et lacuna usque ad* "-bro" *PL* || VIII] *om.* V 2 et Ovidio ... Metemorfoseos] *illeg. et lacuna PL* || Metemorfoseos] Montemolfesios *N1* 2-3 Phitagusas] *om.* *P3* || Phitagusas ... dice] *illeg. et lacuna PL* 3 Sanaria] Sanaria *corr. ad.* Hanaria *SN2*, Hanaria *P3* || deseseno] dissino *GC* 3-4 Colles ... populi] *lacuna et illeg. PL* 4 dictas] dictans *E*, dictum *P2* 4-5 de poy ... signiure] *om.* *E* 5-6 cum ... capere et] (*illeg.*) ... providentia che no eran sofficienti e ... (*illeg.*) capereno e potereno *PL* 5 prudencia] providentia *E* || ci] et *GC*, elli *SN2* || ci trovarono] extimarno *E* 6 de] ove *E* 6-7 habero ... maturo] *illeg. et lacuna PL* 7 peterono (*N1*)] potereno *P1*, *M1*, parterono *V*, cercorno *SN2*, *P3* 7-8 le quale ... Cume] *om.* *E* 8 ancora (*V*)] anche *M1*, *GC*, *om.* *P1*, *F*, *N1*, *P2*, *SN1*, *SN2*, *P3* 9 dormire ... et] pregnyta che dormeva la quale *PL*, pregna la quale dormiva et *E*, per questo *add.* *F*, *P2*, *SN1* 10 dovere essere] *om.* *PL*, essere *F*, *P2*, *SN1* || et] per laquale augurio *PL*, *om.* *GC* || gran] multitudin seu *add.* *GC* 11 et per questo] *om.* *PL* || per (*P1*)] *om.* *M1*, *V*, *GC* 12 inpercio che Cuma] zo è Chuma *PL*, *om.* *P2* || che ... dormire] che tanto vene ad dire Cuma in greco quanto in latino dormire *N1*, *SN2*, *P3* || è dicto] vol dire *F*, *P2*, *SN1* 13 tit. *add.* *SN2*, *P3* 16 Poi ... forono] Po disciesi *PL*, *E*, *V* 17 quale] quillo *V*, *SN1* 18 dessernere] fare *F*, *P2*, *SN1* || determinato] terminato *GC*, di- (*lacuna*) *PL* || cossi] *om.* *PL*, *E*, *V* || che] perche *GC* 20 hedificare ... laquale] la cita *GC* 21 hedificata] facta *N1*, *SN2*, *P3* || magnificata] magnifica *E*, *P2*, *GC*

habondevole luoco de aqua et fertile et plino de silve. Innella quale  
citate florida et allegra per spacio de multi anni con grande gloria et  
tranquillitate pervende Dedalo in quillo tempo che la cita de Roma era in  
prosperitate. Intando Dedalo era lo migliore de tucti li homine li quali  
viveano

5

et singularo mastro in omne arte  
methamatica et in fabrica et lo dicto  
Dedalo hedificò uno templo alla sum-  
mita de la cita de Cume de che Virgi-  
lio ne fa mencione alo Eneyda per suoy  
versi cossi dicendo:

10

Dedalus ut fama est fugiens minoya  
regna  
Prepetibus pennis ausus se cadere celo  
Insuetum pariter gelidos erravit ad  
arthos  
Calcidi tamquam levis tandem  
superastitit artem  
At pius Eneas artes quibus alter Apollo  
Presidet horrendeque procul secreta  
sibilla  
Redditus hiis tandem terris tibi Febe  
sacravit  
Remigium alarum  
Sic fatur lacrimans classique imictit  
habonas  
Et tandem Euboytis Cumarum ad  
labitur omnis.

15

20

25

1 de aqua] *om. F, P2, SN1* 2 allegra] *alegrecza P2, con alegrecza SN1* || con grande] *om. P1, in N1, SN2, P3, stectero in F, P2, SN1* 3 tranquillitate] *stecte add. N1, SN2, P3* || pervende] *pervenendo GC* || Dedalo] *om. N1* || Roma] *lacuna PL* 4 Intando] *et N1, allora E, SN2, P3, in quel tempo F, P2, SN1* 5 viveano (*P1*)] *veniano M1, GC, etc. add. PL* 6 et] *era add. F, P2* || mastro] *modo GC* || arte] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3* 7 fabrica] *frabricare V* 8 hedificò] *om. V* 10 ne] *de N1* || mencione ... suoy] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3* 11 cossi] *om. GC* 12 minoya] *minora V* 14 prepetibus] *pro petibus V* || pennis] *pegnis V* || cadere] *credere SN1* || celo] *celos GC* 15 pariter] *per iter SN1* || gelidos] *geridos GC* || erravit] *enavit SN1* 16 arthos] *archos P1, F, N1, V, P2, GC, SN2, P3* 17 Calcidi tamquam] *Calcidicaque SN1* || levis] *lentus SN1* 19 quibus] *quilibet SN2, P3* || alter] *alit P1, altus SN1* 20 horrendeque] *orrenstemque GC* 22 Redditus] *reddulus GC* || terris] *estris N1* || Febe] *facile P1, felice F, N1, P2, P3, fabe GC, illeg. SN2* 24 Remigium (*V*)] *renugum P1, remigum M1, F, N1, reg<sup>m</sup> GC* || alarum] *clarum GC, statuitque inmani templa add. SN1* 25 fatur] *facere P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, frater V* || lacrimans] *lacrimis GC* || imictit] *imicti P1, F, N1, P2, GC, mictit V* 26 habonas] *habenda P1, P2, thabenda F, N1, habenis V, habenas SN1, GC, P3, aben(?) SN2* 28 labitur] *labore F, N1, illeg. SN2* || omnis] *oris V, P2, SN1, onus SN2, P3*

*Due to a plague in Cumae, many moved to the site of Parthenope's tomb to escape it. After it passed they wanted to stay, but because many of their compatriots had remained at Cumae, they felt constrained to return. [B: Aeneid verses found in chapter 2A offered here.]*

5

Come fo hedificata la cita de Cume vi venne una gran mortalita.

Hedificata dunque la dicta cita de Cume et in multi modi ampliata per quilli de Calcidia et di Euboya como è dicto de sopra, o vero per corrucione de li laghe vicini o per volunta devina, sì grande mortalita infestao li dicti cittadini che la dicta cita finalmente quasi destrusse. 10  
Laquale cosa vedendo multi de li cittadini, et che per niuno agiuto de medici se poteano defendere, determinareno mutare le loro habitaciune et cossi fo factò. Et vennero alo sepulcro o vero templo de Partenope inello quale templo e campi vicini essi co.lloro fameglya si aspectaro infine actanto che la dicta mortalita cessò. Dapoy la dicta mortalita che 15  
per la contemperanza de lo ayro, che per la dolcezze de lo luoco, et eciam dio per la pagura passata non curavano de tornare ad Cuma, ma per la pyu parte de.lloro che erano remasi ala cita de Cuma forono constrictè de tornare alla dicta cita de Cume co.lloro vergognya.

Versus: 20

Dedalus ut fama est fugiens minoya  
regna

Prepetibus pennis ausus se credere  
celo

Insuetum per iter gelidos erravit ad  
arthos 25

Caladitamque levis tandem super  
astitit arcem.

6 *tit. om. P1, F, V, PL, E, P2, SN1* || fo] poi *SN2, P3* || vi venne] venendo *GC* 7 ampliata] amplicita *GC* 8 quilli] li quali *P1, F, N1* || Calcidia] Calcidonia *V, SN1* || è] ho *P2* || vero] de sopra *add. GC* 9 corrucione (*N1*)] correzione *M1, P1, SN1, GC* || o] et *SN1* || devina] vene *add. V* || sì] *om. F* 10 infestao] infestato *V*, assagliò *PL* || che] de *GC* || finalmente] *om. F, P2* 11 multi de] *om. SN2, P3* || che] *om. GC* || niuno] modo ne per *add. SN2, P3* 12 medici] media *PL* || determinareno] deliberaro *P2* || mutare (*V*)] murare *M1, P1, F, P2, GC*, morare *N1* || le loro] loco et *E* 13 sepulcro o vero] *om. F, V, P2, SN1* 14 inello ... vicini] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3* || templo (*V*)] tempo *M1* || essi] et si *P1*, et li *P2*, et là *F, N1, SN1, SN2, P3* 15 cessò] *om. GC* || Dapoy] il fine de *add. PL* || dapoy ... mortalita] *om. E, P2, GC* 16 de] che per *P1, F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2* || luoco] lito *F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 16-17 eciam dio] chi *F, P2, SN1* 17 ma per] ma perche *N1, SN2, P3* 19 co.lloro vergognya] *om. F, P2* 23 credere] cedere *E* 25 per iter] per ver *E* 26 arthos] archos *E* 27 Caladitamque] Calcidiamque *E* || levis] letus *E*

At pius Eneas arcem quibus altus  
 Apollo  
 Presidet horrendaeque procul secreta  
 sibille  
 Redditus hiis tandem terris tibi Phebe 5  
 sacrauit  
 Remigium alarum posuitque inmania  
 templa  
 Sic fatur lacrimans classisque immittit  
 habenas 10  
 Et tandem Euboicis Chumarum  
 adlabitur oris.

## 4

*When a second plague arrived, the Cumaeans consulted the oracle of Apollo who instructed them to settle at Parthenope and prophesied the city's future growth and fame. Some farmers did not wish to leave, but the majority of gentlemen and lords moved to Parthenope.* 15

Lì tornati li cumani con vergognya ala loro habitacione li quali erano partiti da Cume per timore de la mortalitate dapoy de spacio de deyce anni si li molistao la secunda mortalitate pyu feroce de la prima inpercio 20 de la prima mortalita habero remedio mutando la habitacione et abero sanitate. Unde andaro alo templo de Apollo per prendere consiglyo dalluy che deveano fare per mutare in tucto quillo luoco. Dalo quale avuta risposta li fo consiglyato che petano et recercheno Parthonope et in quillo luoco se allocheno et fermeno le loro habitaciune in percio 25 che de.loro medesimo si se multiplicarra la cita de bono in meglyo et serra multo honorata inter l'altre cita famosesseme. Laquale cosa fo facta ma non comonemente inpercio che alcuna parte de laborature liquali

5 tibi] ubi E 9 sic ... lacrimans] siccatur lassas E 13 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 18 Li tornati] [ ]i tornati P1, et tornati N1, SN1, SN2, P3, tornati E, ritornati PL, E, V, P2, GC || con vergognya] om. F, P2, SN1 19 per] paura et add. V || dapoy de] non multo appresso ma per F, P2, SN1 20 si li molistao] om. PL, si le mostraro E || mortalitate] gli assagliò molto add. PL, multo add. F, E, P2, SN1 || feroce] forte GC 20-21 inpercio ... prima] om. V 21 mortalita] om. F, P2, SN1 || habero] ricieveron PL, E || remedio ... abero] om. SN2, P3 || mutando] repet. SN1 21-22 et abero sanitate] om. F, P2, SN1 22 Unde andaro] unde sinde andaro PL, et andatasone E, et andando.nde F, P2, SN1 || prendere] piglyare PL 23 dalluy] om. P2, GC || per] se aveano da F, P2, SN1 24 petano] vadino E, poteano V || petano et recercheno] recerchassero F, P2, cercasse SN1 25 se allocheno et] om. F, P2, SN1 || fermeno] refeceno P1, refermeno N1, SN2, P3, sumino E, refermassero F, P2, SN1 26 medesimo] seme PL, E, V || multiplicarra] multiplicaria F || bono] bene F, P2, SN2 27 serra] seria F 28 alcuna] la magiore F, P2, SN1 || laborature] li habituri P1, li habitaturi F, N1, P2, SN2, P3, laborare V

coltivavano le terre non cossi legeremente poteano mutare habitacione non se volcero partire. Ma grande parte de gentile homine et signyure cole loro cose mobile si cercaro et petereno Parthonope et in quello medesimo loco incomenzareno ad hedificare ciascano secundo la sua potencia et lo stato de sua condicione.

5

## 5

*Parthenope was named for a virgin daughter of the king of Sicily who died and was buried there. The name is attested in several ancient authors.*

Dicto è adunche in quillo tempo Partonope et tale nomo piglyò da una iovenecta non maritata vergene chyamata Parthonope de una eccellente et grandissima bellecze figlyola de lo re de Cicilia. La quale venendo con grande multitudine de nave ad Baya casualmente si ammalò et in quillo medesimo loco de quella infirmitate fo morta et in quillo luoco sepellita fo. Per la quale sepultura si fo facto lo templo et consequentemente la cita la quale meritò essere chyamata Parthonope secundo che dicono Ysidero, Papia, et Virgilio alo quarto libro de la Georgica per soy versi: Ille Virgilium me tempore dulcis alebat Partenope; et Ovidio de Methemorseoseo alo terczo libro: Et in ocio natam Parthonope.

10

15

## 6

*After many years of peace, the Parthenopeans began to fight among themselves. Thus a noble, rich young knight named Tiberius Julius Tarsus resolved to leave with some followers and establish a new city not far from Parthenope, on the other side of the foothills of Mount Falerno.*

20

---

1 habitacione] stansia PL 2 partire] mutare habitacione PL || Ma] ma una F, una SN2, P3 3 et petereno] et partirono da V, om. F, P2, SN1 3-4 in ... loco] là PL, cosci là F, P2, SN1 5 potencia] poter SN1 6 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 9 è] om. N1, V || in] de P1, N1, E, SN1, P2, SN2, P3, om. PL || in quillo tempo] de quillo tempo P1, F, N1, E, P2, SN2, P3, de quillo templo SN1, quel templo PL || Partonope ... nomo] et tale nome Pertonope F, che tal nome Partenope P2 10 chyamata] la quale se chiamava F, P2, SN1 11 grandissima] et nobele add. P1, F, N1, SN1, P2, SN2, P3 || La quale venendo] che vene PL 12 de nave] om. N1 || Baya] laquale add. PL || si ammalò] infermò PL 13 de quella infirmitate] om. PL 13-14 de quella infirmitate ... sepellita fo] sepelita E, sepellita fo GC 13 in quillo luoco] là PL 14 fo] om. P3 || si] ivi E || consequentemente] conseguente P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 15 la quale] om. E, GC || chyamata] amata GC 16 quarto] iii° V || per soy versi] om. PL, E, V[idelicet?] add. P1 || Ille] illo PL, E 17 dulcis] om. P2 || alebat] habeat P1, F, N1, SN1, SN2, habebat P2, P3 || Methemorseoseos] Metamolfos P3 18 ocio natam] ociatam GC || Parthonope] in ocio natam Partenopem add. SN1 19 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3

Costructa et hedificata la cita parthonopeya et tale nomo alley inposta  
 da Parthonope li citadine suoy per gran spacio de tempo vissero in pace  
 et in tranquillitate. Et inpercio che niuna grande cita pote stare longo  
 tempo in quiete et che se da fore non ave inimici li trova da entro de.lley  
 medesimo, et inpercio dentro delloro so nate brighe et discordie per loro  
 ricchezze et altre habundancie. Per la quale cosa uno iovene chyamato  
 per nomo Tiberio Julio Tarso loquale inter li altri citadini per nobilita  
 et ricchezze et vertute resblendea con certi soy sequaci consencienti si  
 determinò de volerese partire da li altri et da quillo luoco et hedificare  
 una nova cita poco da longa ala cita parthonopeya, la quale secundo se  
 scrive era posta ad traverso socto le sponde de lo monte de Falerno lo  
 quale ogi è chyamato Sancto Heramo per lo populaczo.

## 7

*With his own funds Tiberius built the new city, called "Neapolis," and a  
 temple to Apollo, as a Greek inscription on it attests. The inscription still  
 exists and was translated by Niccolò da Reggio, physician of King Robert.*

Questa sopradicta cita ad soy proprie spese lo predicto Tiberio Julio Tarso  
 [fece] in quillo modo como luy la considerò in uno loco et avantagiato  
 et murata et circuyta de nobilissima mura che l'ebe. Ipso et tucti l'altri  
 la chiamò Napolis in greco che in latino vole dire cita nova. Inella quale  
 hedificare fe uno mirabile templo de marmore tucto ad honore de Apollo,  
 indelo fronte del quale templo fe intaglyare et inscolpire lictere greche

1 Costructa et] *om. F, P2, SN1* || et] per *PL* || nomo] modo *V* 2 Parthonope] la dicta  
 donna *F, P2, SN1* 3 Et] ma *F, P2* 4 in] pace et *add. SN1* || inimici] inimicia  
*GC* 5 inpercio ... nate] chussi nacque de fra loro *N1, SN2, P3*, intro di casa per la  
 gran ricchezza et habundantia fo nate *PL*, non per spacio de longo tempo per loro gran  
 ricchezze fra loro venne gran *F, P2, SN1* 5-6 per loro ... habundancie] inter de ipsi  
*PL, om. F, P2, SN1* 7 loquale] *om. SN1* 8 resblendea] restendea *P1*, respondia *GC* ||  
 consencienti] conoscenti *E* 9 de volerese] de.sse *PL, om. F, P2, SN1* || partire] *om. GC* ||  
 et da quillo luoco] *om. PL* || et] *om. GC* 11 scrive] dice *SN2, P3* || sponde] faude overo  
 scappe *PL*, spalle *E* || Falerno] Salerno *P1, F, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3* 12 ogi] mo *PL, E* ||  
 è chyamato] se chiama *E, SN1* || per lo populaczo] *om. PL, E* 13 *tit. add. SN2, P3*  
 17 Questa] in esta *N1* 17-18 lo predicto Tiberio ... considerò] chomo la considerò  
 chosi la fecie *PL* 18 in] *om. GC* || considerò] considerato *V, GC* || in] et *N1* || loco  
 (*P1*)] longo *M1, GC* 19 murata] mara *N1* || circuyta] circondata *GC* || de nobilissima]  
 intorno di notabili *PL* || che l'ebe] che ebbe *V*, che de po *N1, SN2, P3*, et de po *F, P2,*  
*SN1* 19-20 ipso ... chiamò] da ipso e gli altri fo chiamata *PL* 19 et] *om. N1* ||  
 l'altri] *om. V* 20 in greco] *om. PL* || in greco che in latino] che in greco latino *V* ||  
 vole] viene a *PL, E* 21 templo] tempo *GC* || tucto] *om. PL* 22 quale] *om. F* ||  
 intaglyare et inscolpire] intagliare *E*, scrivere di *PL* || greche] de greci *GC*

le quale narrano lo nome de lo hedificatore de la cita et de lo templo. La quale scriptura per fine al di d'oggi se pote legere manifestamente et foro translatare per uno maystro Nicola de Regio de lo inclito signyore re Roberto fisico greco loquale lictere se contenenno le subscribe parole.

- A Tiberius Julius Tarsus et dyoscorus civitatem et tenplum et ea que sunt in tenplo domini peliani filius et distributor de propriis hedificavit. Tiberio Julio Tarso et diostoro la cita il templo e le chuose che so nel templo di missere peliano eylis et distributore di iproprii suoy hedificao. 5 B

## 8

*After Naples was built, Parthenope came to be called Palaepolis ("old city"). The people of both came from Calcis and Euboea. Naples waged wars against other Campanian cities and Rome. Once it was captured by Beneventans and Nolans, which inspired a Roman seige. Two Palaepolitans lifted the seige with the help of the Romans, and the occupying Beneventans fled the city.* 10 15

Como fo hedificata la cita de Napoli et como perdiò lo nomo parthonopeya cita propinqua ad epsa.

Poy la hedificazione de la nova cita in greco chyamata Neapolis la cita perthonopeya a poco a poco incomenzò ad perdere lo nomo. Et advenia che quando nominare voleano Parthonope, nominavano Palepoli, che tanto vole dire Palepoli in greco, quanto cita vecchya in latino. De lo 20

1 le quale narrano] *om. PL*, le narrano *P1, SN2, P3*, che narrano *N1*, li quali narravano *V*, narrandolli *F, P2, SN1* || lo nome (*P1*)] *om. M1* 2 di d'oggi] questo tempo *PL* 3 foro] *om. PL, E* || translatare] translate *P1, F, N1, E, SN2, P3* || signyore] *om. V* 3-4 re Roberto] Roberto re de Sicilia *SN1* 4 greco] *om. E* || loquale lictere se contenenno] contiene *PL* || parole] *om. P2*

A 5-8 Tiberius ... hedificavit] *om. P1* 5 et] *om. P2* || dyoscorus] diasancsus *V*, diosterus *GC* 7 domini peliani] diopoliani *SN2, P3* || peliani] poliani *N1*, pleliam *V*, peliam *P2, GC* || et] *om. P2*, in *GC* 7-8 distributor] sributor *GC* 8 de (*P1*)] da *M1, om. V*

B 6 le chuose che] li edifici i quali *E* 7 peliano eylis] pilia noelis *E*

16-17 *tit. om. P1, PL, F, E, V, P2, SN1, pos. ad finem cap. 7 GC* 16 fo] facta *add. SN1* 17 cita] *om. SN2, P3* 18 Neapolis] Napoli *PL* 18-19 la cita perthonopeya] *om. V* 19 perdere] prendere *N1, SN1* 20 nominare] chiamare *P2* 20-21 che tanto ... latino] in greco quanto cicta vecchia in latino *P1*, in greco vol dire cita vecchia in latino *F, SN1*, in greco che vol dir civita vecchia in latino *P2*, che in greco dice cita vecchia *N1, SN2, P3*, in greco, che in latino viene a dire cita vecchia, che tanto e a dire pale in greco quanto in latino vecchio *PL, E*

populo de la quale Palepoli fo facta Napoli et afferma questo Titulivio nel VI libro de Urbe condita. La quale cita de Palepoli non fo troppo da longa dove ogi è posta Napoli habitata de lo populo de duy citate ch'èbero principio da quilli de Cuma avendo origine da Calcidia et da Euboya li quali venendo per mare con multe nave da lloro habitacione 5 primo dimoraro ala insula Sinari et Phitacusa dapoy forono deliberati de fareno mutacione et partirenosse da quillo loco el quale loro non capeano. Unde Lactancio dice alo quarto libro, Li habitature de Cuma si mutaro la loro habitacione. Questa cita de Napoli cola sua forcza et colla potencia de quilli de Benevento coli quali aveano compagnya si 10 fecero multe bactaglye contra li romani et coli habitature de lo territorio de Capua et de Salerno. Secundo che se dice, questa cita uno certo tempo da poy fo piglyata da quattro milia cavaliere de Benevento et duy milia de Nola. De poy un certo tempo lo populo de Roma et Philo loro consulo per parte de lo populo de Roma venendo per piglyare questa predicta 15 cita si la assediò et posse lo suo exercito inter l'una cita et l'altra accio che l'una seccorrere non potesse l'altra. Allora si insiò da fore Coriolao et Inphio citadine de la cita de Palepoli et andati alla assediata citate la piglyaro per lo agiuto de li romani. Per la quale cosa per la via de la

---

1 Palepoli] *om.* SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || facta] habitata PL, E, V || afferma] actesta P<sub>2</sub> || questo] dicto *add.* N<sub>1</sub> 2 La quale cita] che dicie PL, il quale dice E || Palepoli] Napoli N<sub>1</sub> 3 dove] fo et *add.* V || ogi] *om.* PL, E || ogi è posta] èi oge N<sub>1</sub>, è hoggi la cita de SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || ogi ... citate] *om.* GC || de lo populo] da dui populi F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || citate] citadini P<sub>1</sub>, F, SN<sub>1</sub>, captadini P<sub>2</sub>, citati in N<sub>1</sub> 4 origine] principio et origine PL, principio P<sub>2</sub> 5 habitacione] casi PL 6 dimoraro] stectiro PL, donaro GC || Phitacusa (PL)] Ficosa P<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>1</sub>, F, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub>, GC, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, Fiscosa N<sub>1</sub> 6-7 forono ... de] deliberaro F 7 fareno] habitacione et *add.* GC || forono ... mutacione] fecero deliberacione de mutacione N<sub>1</sub>, fuorono audaci di mutare quella stansia PL, fuorono dudati de far mutacione E, fuorono liberati di fare mutacione V, deliberaro fare mutacione SN<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub> || et partirenosse ... loco] *om.* PL || el quale] nel quale SN<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, *om.* GC 7-8 el quale ... capeano] *om.* E, che non ci capevano etc. PL, el quale loro non capaneino P<sub>1</sub>, nel quale loco non capavano P<sub>2</sub> 8 quarto] quinto V 9 si mutaro ... habitacione] *om.* PL || la loro] da loro SN<sub>1</sub>, *om.* P<sub>2</sub> || de Napoli] *om.* PL, E || forcza] fortetca SN<sub>2</sub> 10 colla] sua *add.* GC || colla potencia] *om.* PL, E, P<sub>2</sub> 11 contra] cum E 12 se (P<sub>1</sub>)] *om.* M<sub>1</sub>, se la PL || uno certo tempo] una fiata N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, *om.* PL, E || certo] *om.* F, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub> 13 da poy] *om.* P<sub>1</sub>, F, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || duy milia] cavaliere *add.* V 14 un] venne GC || un certo tempo] *om.* PL, E || de Roma] *om.* PL, E 14-15 et Philo ... de Roma] *om.* N<sub>1</sub>, V, SN<sub>1</sub>, GC, et Philo consulo dili Romani PL, de Philo el consulo de Romani per parte del populo de Roma E 15 piglyare] prendere PL 16 exercito] assedio N<sub>1</sub> 16-17 accio ... l'altra] *om.* V 17 seccorrere] sobvenire ... a PL || potesse] possa GC || da fore] *om.* PL, fore P<sub>2</sub> 18 assediata] *om.* PL, E 19 cosa] i Nolani *add.* PL



parte sinistra de la cita per la via che va ad Nola fugereno scaczati li beneventani da la dicta cita.

## 9

*Neapolitan aggression led Rome to declare war. With help from Naples' neighbors, Rome captured Naples and treated the Neapolitans most cruelly. In this same year, Alexander built Alexandria in Egypt.* 5

Como la cita de Napoli fo presa da li nolani.

Advenne fenalemente per le cose contrarie facte per li napolitani contra li romani, bandero et publicaro la guerra contra li napolitani. Li quali romani foro in numero de tre milia homine ad cavallo colo favore et agiuto deli beneventani et de quilli dela valle de Gaudio li quali foro in numero de duy milia. Dall'uno de li lati incomenczata la bactaglya dal'altro lato sopravenne lo populo de Nola con tucta sua potencia li quali foro in numero de duy milia homine ad cavallo et vennero in quillo luoco dove per fine mo se chyama ad Campo ad Nola et si piglyaro la cita de Napoli. Li quali napolitani forono tractati como ad nemici multo crodelemente. In quisto anno che fo pigliata Napoli, re Alexandro hedificò Alexandria la quale è in Egicto secundo che actesta Titolivio alo octavo libro de Urbe condita. 15

## 10

## 20

*A territorial dispute between Naples and Nola was settled by a Roman representative, who deviously claimed for Rome the neutral land they left between them. The castle of Somma above it was so named because this was the summit of discord between Naples and Nola.*

---

1 parte] dericta oviro *add.* V || per la via] per la strada E, *om.* SN<sub>1</sub> || li (PL)] et M<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>1</sub>, N<sub>1</sub>, GC, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, *om.* V, et cosi F, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub> 7 nolani] romani N<sub>1</sub>, GC, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, *tit. om.* P<sub>1</sub>, PL, F, V, E, P<sub>2</sub>, *cap.* 8 & 9 uniti SN<sub>1</sub> 8 advenne] avendo GC || fenalemente] che P<sub>2</sub> 9 romani] che i romani *add.* PL, E, V, li quali romani *add.* SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || guerra] briga E, bactaglia per ipsi PL 10 foro] *om.* PL, E || tre] quactro P<sub>1</sub>, F, N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, trenta GC || tre ... cavallo] duy milia da l'uno lato incomenzaro la bactaglia de decee milia homini a cavallo V || homine] *om.* PL 11 et agiuto] *om.* PL || li quali foro] *om.* PL, E 12-14 Dall'uno de li lati ... duy milia] *om.* N<sub>1</sub> 13 dal'altro (P<sub>1</sub>)] dall'utro M<sub>1</sub> || sopravenne] sopravvenente PL || lo populo ... potencia] la potensa dil popolo di Nola PL 13-14 li quali foro] *om.* PL, E 14 homine] *om.* PL, E 14-15 et vennero ... luoco] *om.* PL, in quel luoco E 15 dove] unde GC || per fine mo] ancora in questo tempo PL, per fino adesso E, per fi al presente SN<sub>1</sub> 16 Li quali] et GC, del che li SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || forono tractati] tractaro PL 20 *tit. add.* N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>

In successione de non multo gran tempo nacque grande discordia inter li napolitani et quilli de Nola per le fine et territorie secundo narra Valerio Maximo nelo libro VI nelo capitulo de Le cose brevemente facte o dicte. Per la quale cosa fo mandato da Roma per lo senato, lu quale Roma signyoriava l'una cita et l'altra, Quinto Fabio Labione doctore de lege 5 per arbitro ad determinare le dicte fine. Loquale Quinto Fabio venendo si ammoniò l'uno et l'altri cittadini che dementicando la avaricia et discordia ciascuno destrengere se devesse dentro deli termini suoy pyu tosto che devere innante correre. Per la quali cosa ambenduy li dicti populi et cittadini dele predictate citati s'il feceno per la auctoritate de quisto Quinto 10 Fabio et si presero li termine. Inter l'una parte et l'altra lassaro uno poco de campo in nel meczzo el quale campo el dicto Quinto Fabio o per modo de gabo o per una scolta e grande avaricia illo lo acquistò alo populo de Roma et alo dicto populo iudicò che fosse dato. El quale territorio fine alo di de ogi se chyama Campo Romano nel quale luoco nasse bonissimo 15 greco. Sopre alo termine de lo predicto territorio fo hedificato lo nobele castello de Somma quasi vole dire questa è la somma de lo litigio inter li napolitani et nolani secundo che dice Valerio Maximo nelo octavo libro nelo secundo capitulo.

---

1 non multo] multo *PL, E, pos. post* "tempo" *GC* || gran] *om. V* || nacque] si fo nata *PL*, fo nata *E* 2 fine et] confine de *E*, confine et *F, V, P2, SN1*, fine e termini deli *PL* || secundo] actesta overo *add. N1, SN2, P3* 3 VI] VII *PL, E* || brevemente] gravemente *PL, E* || o] et *N1, E, V, SN1, SN2, P3* 4 Per ... cosa] et *PL, E* || fo mandato da] mandaro a *V*, fo mandato ad *GC* || da Roma] *om. PL, E, SN1* || lu quale Roma] romano che *PL, E* 4-5 lu quale ... l'altra] *om. SN1* 5 Fabio Labione] Fabione *P2*, Fabio Lalio *SN2, P3* || doctore] fattore *P3* 6 ad determinare] determinao *N1*, et determinare *SN1*, ad deminare *P1*, ad terminare *P2* || Quinto] dicto *SN1* || Quinto Fabio] *om. PL, E* || venendo] venuto *SN2, P3* 7 ammoniò] danno *E* || l'uno ... cittadini] l'una et l'altra comunita *N1, SN2, P3* || dementicando] lassando *PL* 8 destrengere] constringere *PL, E*, restrengere *V*, strengere *N1, P2* || termini] terreni *P1* || suoy ... che] *om. V* || tosto] presto *SN2, P3* 9 devere ... correre] *om. V*, volererne altro vedere *F, P2*, altro vedere *SN1* 9-10 Per la quali ... feceno] la qual chuosa *PL, E* 9 ambenduy] tucti dui *P2* 11 et si presero] fecero e possero *PL*, si posero *E*, et sci fecero *F, P2, SN1* || inter ... l'altra] *om. PL, E* || poco] pro *P1* 12 in nel ... campo] *om. V, P2, SN1* || el] e *GC* 13 gabo ... avaricia] gabaricia *P1*, gabaricia o per altra via *N1, SN2, P3*, gabbaria *F, P2, SN1* || illo lo] allo *GC* 14 populo] Napoli *E* || iudicò (*V*)] yo dico *P1, M1, F, N1, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, P3*, indicao *E* 15 ogi] mo *PL* || nel quale luoco] dove *PL, E* || bonissimo] vino *add. E* 17 vole] nel *N1, a PL, E* 18 Maximo] *om. PL, E*

*Hannibal beseiged Naples after the Battle of Cannae. Realizing its walls could not be breached, he lured the Neapolitans outside the walls and ambushed them. A brave Neapolitan put the Africans to flight before being killed.*

5

Scrive Titulivio nel terczo libro de la secunda bactaglya de Africa dove dice che Anibal duca de li africani de poy la bactaglya de Cannis multo desiderò avere la cita de Napoli per la marina. Per la quale cosa la venne ad assediare. El quale Anibal era infirmo et habe per tre dì la febre et da poy volendo piglyare la dicta citate per forcza silli dede alcuno assalto ma vedendola intorno circuyta de mirabile mura et altesseme et cognossendo suo pensiero non ressure non vole pyu assaltarela et canossendo et vedendola si forte perde la speranza de may pyu poterela avere. Et inpercio fece fare grande robarie et corrarie desponendo li suoy cavaleri nello cavalcare inviere de le porte facendono grande prede. Inter le quale prede li napolitani un dì volendola defendere et succorrere si combactero coli africani, che li africani non pareano troppo gente et pareano male conposti. Ma li africani stavano pyu provedutamente che llo loro non credeano et li napolitani li quali insiero ala bactaglya si forono in nanti assaltati dali africani per gabo et inbuscamento de li quali napolitani ne perereno multi et maximamente ze fo ucciso uno nobele et

10  
15  
20

---

1 *tit. add.* N1, SN2, P3 6 scrive] testifica lu predicto PL, testifica E || secunda] om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN1, P3 6-7 dove dice] om. PL, E 7 Cannis] Ginnasi E, pontis de Cannis V 8 desiderò] di poter *add.* E || per ... cosa] et E, et quando PL 9 el quale ... et] om. PL, et E || Anibal] om. SN1 || per tre dì] duo giorni PL 10-11 silli ... assalto] vi vene con tucto suo exercito PL 11 mirabile] notabile E 12 et cognossendo ... ressure] om. PL || ressure] resistere SN1, essiri GC || assaltarela] assalirla E, assediarla V || et] ma F, P2 12-13 et canossendo ... vedendola] che cognoscea et vedeala SN2, P3 13 canossendo ... forte] om. PL, E || may pyu] mai E, giammay PL, non pyu V 14 et ... fare] inansi fe PL, E fare] om. GC || inpercio] de po N1, SN1 || grande] om. PL 15 nello] per arte lo meglio che seppe di PL || nello cavalcare] om. GC || inviere de le] et correndoli fine nel F, P2, SN1 || inviere de le porte] om. N1 || porte] parti GC 15-16 facendono ... Inter] om. PL 16 Inter ... prede] om. E || un dì] om. PL, E, uno V || defendere et succorrere] soccorrere PL, defendere et riscotere E 17 che li africani] che PL, E, N1, SN2, P3, om. P1, F, P2, SN1, GC || pareano] portarono V, parendo alloro SN1, parendo F, P2 18 pareano] om. E, GC parendoli P2 || stavano] om. GC || provedutamente] providentemente SN1 19 che ... credeano] om. PL 19-21 li quali insiero ... napolitani] om. GC 19 ala bactaglya] om. PL 20 dali ... inbuscamento] da lo imboscamento digli africani PL || gabo et] inganno de SN1 || inbuscamento] imbasciamento P3 21 multi] gentili e valentissimi homini *add.* PL || maximamente] om. N1, SN2, P3

extrenuo homo chyamato Egea mastro de la cavallaria cioè de la milicia lu quale essendo nela bactaglya fo gictato morto da lo suo cavallo in terra. Quisto sequitava troppo asperamente li inimici per sua verilitate de animo. Multi altri ne fugerono per la via de la marina.

- A Et se non che la cita ne fo advisata che dedeno succurso da la marina con nave et barche de piscature tucti erano prisi et morti et specialemente camparo quilli li quali sapevano natate che fugerono ale dicte nave et barche et se non per questo aviso tucti erano prisi et morti. 5 B
- E se non forsi che fuorno agiutati et ebono seccurso dale navi e dale barche di piscadori maximamente quegli che sapiano natate che fugiero ale dicte barche e navi tucti forriano stati morti. 10

De poy de quisto Anibal fece la via de Capua.

## 12

*Afterward, the Neapolitans sought Rome's friendship in order to have Roman aid when necessary. Their ambassadors noted Rome's poverty after the long war and offered it forty golden cups. The Romans thanked them and took only the smallest cup.* 15

Et secundo la sentencia de quillo vulgale et usato proverbio che dice, po dampno facto napolitan macto fa pacto, poy data ad ipsi la uccisione et sconficta da lo dicto Anibal li napolitani desiderando con dericta fede fareno amicicia colo populo de Roma per esserono agiutati et succursi da ipsi quando abesognyasse per alcuno bisognyo et necessitate, si mandaro inbassature per aiuto et subvensione de li romani con quaranta tasse de 20

1 extrenuo] extremo P1 || homo] giovane PL 1-2 mastro ... gictato] om. V 1 la cavallaria] li cavalieri PL, E || cioè ... milicia] om. PL, E 2 nela bactaglya] om. PL, E 2-3 in terra] om. PL, E 3 troppo] multo PL, E, om. SN2, P3 || asperamente] forte PL 3-4 per sua ... animo] om. PL

A 5-6 Et se non ... marina] om. V, P3 6 dedeno] dendono GC || da] per la via de SN1 8 prisi] persi SN1 8-9 camparo] scappavano SN1 11-12 per questo ... morti] om. V

B 5 forsi] om. E 6 dale] da quelli de le E 7 maximamente] et specialmente E 9 dicte] diece E || navi] si non per questo add. E

14 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 19 la sentencia] repet. P1 || che dice] om. PL, E, dice GC 20 napolitan] alli napolitani V, el E || poy] om. N1 || uccisione] occasione V, vinsione GC 20-21 et sconficta] om. PL 22 fareno] avere PL, E || lo populo de Roma] lo popolo romano V, E, GC, li romani PL 22-23 per esserono ... necessitate] aczocche fosseno agiutati da essi quando avesseno necessitate PL 24 per aiuto et] e per PL, et GC || romani] si mandaro add. V, mandaro add. PL || tasse] om. P3

oro de grande piso. Et secundo che scrive Titulivio alo secundo libro de la bactaglya de Africa li dicte inbassaturi dessero queste parole: che ali napolitani è chyaro et manifesto che le cose de lo populo de Roma songo quasi devenute ad niente et so vacuate per la longa guerra et per defendere la cita et campi da convecine et per lo capo et fortellecze de Ytalia cioè la  
 5  
 cita et lo imperio de Roma si è facta bactaglya, li dicti napolitani iudicaro essere iusta cosa de quello oro loquale per fine ad quisto tempo li era remaso per ordinato aiuto de li subvenirende lo populo de Roma et se alcuno altro agiuto vuy credete essere indeli napolitani semelemente vi  
 10  
 si proffereno. Et multo sorrebe alloro caro che li senature et lo populo de Roma iudicasseno le cose de li napolitani loro et dicesseno digni quilli liquali li donano pyu volentiere per buono animo et propria voluntate che non per alcuno premio. Ali quali inbassature per la largecza et bona sollicitudene de li napolitani foro rendute multe gratie et con bono amore et con placentia fo piglyata la pyu piccola tassa la quale fo de meno piso  
 15  
 secundo scrive Titulivio.

## 13

*Tiberius built the three principal avenues and major structures of Naples before he died. The rest of the city lay in swamps, especially the area now called Porto, which was then called Aquarie. For this reason one group of  
 20  
 Neapolitans bears the surname Acquaro.*

1 libro] *om. PL* 2-6 che ali napolitani ... cita] che nuy sappiamo le chuose dil populo romani el thesoro per la bactaglia esser vacuato per le citade et campi vicini e pel capo e forteza di Ytalia, zo e il populo romano *PL* 3 de lo populo] *om. V* || de Roma songo] el thesoro con *E* 4 devenute] diminute *N1*, advenuti *V*, diventate *F, P2, SN1* || so] *om. GC* || guerra et] guerre *SN1, P2*, bataglia et briga *E* 4-5 defendere la cita] le discordie *V* 5 et campi (*N1*)] de campi *M1, P1*, et payse *SN1* || da] de *F, V, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, P3* || convecine (*P1*)] converine *M1*, circumvicini *E* || per] *om. SN1* || capo] campo *N1, GC, P3* || fortellecze] forte bellecze *P1, F, P2, SN1*, forteza *E* 6 si è] sia *V* || si è facta bactaglya] per questo *SN1* 7 essere] facto *add. GC* || iusta] iuxta *SN1* 7-8 de quello oro ... lo] de subvenire ad questo tempo alo *SN1* 7 loquale] *om. GC* || fine] fare *V* 8 remaso per] *om. P3* || li subvenirende] la fortuna agiutarende *PL*, la re publica sopravvenendo *E* || de Roma] romano *PL* 9 semelemente] si mente *E* 9-10 vi si proffereno] si proforendo *V*, sende profereno *GC* 10 sorrebe] forrebe *F* 11 napolitani] essere *add. SN1* || loro] *om. GC* || digni (*V*)] dindi *M1, P1*, donde *GC*, vidi *F, N1, P2, SN2, P3*, undi *SN1* 12-13 donano ... premio] danno dono per animo e proprio voluntade *PL* 13 che non] che *F, N1, SN1, P2, SN2, P3, om. P1* || per alcuno] per per niuno *E* 14 de li napolitani] *om. E* || rendute] reducti *GC* || multe] bone *add. P1, N1, F, P2, SN1, SN2, P3* || con] como *V* || bono] grande *PL* 15 et con placentia] *om. P1, F, N1, V, E, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, P3*, e gracie *PL* || pyu] *om. V* 15-16 la quale fo ... Titulivio] e di meno peso che fosse tra laltre. Così dice Titulivio *PL* 16 scrive] dice *E* 17 *tit. add. et cap. pos. post cap. 15 SN2, P3*

Morto finalmente lo dicto Tiberio Julio Tarso lo quale la dicta cita, il templo et li hedificii possi in ipso como è dicto, et la corte dove se examinanno le lite et le habitaciune subterrane de la extate si avea hedificate. Et nelo suo tempo avea facte indellargare la predicta cita con tre ordine de placza et fo ordinata la prima placza dela dicta corte dove se chyama lo foro per fine appresso alo capo de Carbonara la quale se chyama Somma Placza como la pyu soprana in sito. La secunda fo ordinata da la porta la quale se chyama Dompno Urso per fine ala porta de Capuana et la tercza de la Porta Ventosa per fine ala Porta Nolana. Laltro de la dicta cita stando in padule et luochi pline de iunchi fore le mura de la cita et maximamente da presso la placza laquale alo presente se chyama Porto la quale nelo tempo predicto era chymata Acquaro per la quale una progenie de la dicta cita de Napoli se chyama lo loro cognome de Acquaro.

14

15

*Three Palaepolitans who had not followed Tiberius now wished to live in Naples. Each promised to build a fortress to better defend it from the Beneventans and Nolans. (Description of the locations of these fortresses, and of the six original seggi of Naples.)*

Tre gentili homine cio è Albino, Don Petro et Avorio li quali habitavano nela predicta citate de Parthonope e de Palepoli inpercio che lo dicto Tiberio per la discordia et invidia non aveano sequito, advenga Dio che desiderasseno habitare ala citate de Napoli. Feceno pacto co li napolitani che ciaschuno potesse fare una fortellecze de presso le mura de Napoli et

1 Morto (N1) Porto P1, M1, GC || Morto finalmente] om. F, P2, SN1 || Tarso] de add. GC 2 templo] tempo N1 || et li hedificii] om. PL || possi] po V, om. E || et la] alla P1, N1 || dove] de V, divi GC 3 examinanno] esaminaro V, esaminavano N1, SN1, GC, esaminano SN2, P3 || lite] questione PL, dicte cose GC || extate] citate F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 4 hedificate ... avea] om. SN1 || tempo (PL)] templo P1, M1, F, N1, V, P2, GC, SN2, P3 || indellargare] intagliare P2 || la predicta cita] om. PL, E 4-5 con tre] contra GC 5 placza] piaceri SN1 || et fo ... placza] pos. post "foro" PL, E, om. P2 6 foro] focho E || foro ... alo] om. P2 || capo] campo SN1 7 Somma] om. N1, SN2 || in sito] om. E 8 porta] da add. SN2, P3 10 cita] om. P1, F, N1, V, SN2 11 da presso] de fuor E || alo presente] mo PL, E 12 la quale ... Acquaro per] om. GC || nelo] pe del PL, E || tempo] templo P1, F, N1 13 progenie] pregna SN2, P3 13-14 se chyama ... Acquaro] è chiamata de Aquaro E 13 chyama] chiamava SN1 || lo loro cognome] om. PL 15 tit. add. SN2, P3 20 Tre] gran add. PL, E || è] fo SN2, P3 || Albino] Allimo P1, F, N1, alo nono GC, Alvinio P3 21 de Parthonope] parthenopeya PL || Palepoli] Napoli N1 22 Dio] om. PL, E 23 desiderasseno] desiderasse no N1, desiderasse non F, P2, desiderasse de non SN2, P3 23-24 li napolitani ... fare] om. P2 24 ciaschuno] di essi tre add. PL, E || mura de] la dicta terra di add. PL

muniresi ala dicta cita ad cio che fossero pyu forti per le brighe che aveano  
 coli nolani et beneventani. Et cossi fo facto in successione de tempo che  
 Albino fe fare la fortellecze in uno loco appresso de Napoli dove ogi puro  
 se'ncze chyama Albino ove è la ecclesia de Sancta Maria la Nova. Don  
 Pietro fe hedificare un altra fortellecze ad vico de la porta de Capuana la  
 quale fortellecze avea la insuta dall'una parte ala via per la quale se va ad  
 Capua et l'altra insuta per la via la quale se va ad Nola. Et in percio la strata  
 la quale sta de nanti ala dicta fortellecza se chyama Forcella inpercio che  
 la dicta fortellecze se spartia in duy strate. Et è da notare che le strate  
 principale lequale desparteno la cita per traverso so tre, secundo è dicto  
 de sopra. Et li segi antiche si so sey, li quali piglyaro li loro nome per  
 le subscripte raysune, cio è, lo segio de Somma Pyacza chyamato per la  
 altecza de lo sito anche è chyamata Salito cio è Aula Fori. El secundo segio  
 si è lo segio de Sancto Archangelo che è nella secunda strata dove stay lo  
 segnale posto de la victoria avuta da li africani. El terczo segio si è quillo  
 de San Paulo cossi chyamato inpercio che è constructo socto la ecclesia  
 de San Paulo la quale fo primo lo templo facto ad honore de Apollo como  
 è dicto de sopra. El quarto segio si ène quillo de Mercato Vecchio ad  
 differencia de lo mercato novo lo quale fece fare re Carlo primo de li  
 facti de lo quale re Carlo innansi farrimo mencione pyu chyaramente.  
 Altra volta era lo mercato là ovè mo la ecclesia de San Laurenczo la quale  
 stane hedificata socto lo dicto templo de Tiberio hedificato ad honore de

1 muniresi (N1) munireso M1, P1, unirese PL, munere so GC, monirle E, in morose V ||  
 [brighe] guerre PL || aveano] a fare add. PL 2 facto] che add. E || successione] succieso  
 PL 3 Albino] Allino F, habeno GC || ogi] è add. GC 3-4 ogi ... ecclesia de] se chiama  
 PL, E 4 Albino ... Nova] om. GC 5 altra] om. V || ad vico] al vicinato PL, adiunti GC ||  
 Capuana] Capua P2 5-6 la quale fortellecze] che PL, la quale E 6 dall'una ... ala]  
 dalla via per della V 7 Capua] Capuana V || insuta] sita N1, esci subta GC || per la via]  
 ala porta per PL, per add. GC || strata] via PL, E 8-9 se chyama ... fortellecze] om. N1,  
 P3 9 fortellecze] forcella V || strate] parte N1, vie PL, E, parte cio e in doe strate V ||  
 le strate] le vie PL, E 10 lequale] om. N1 || cita] terra PL || so (P1)] om. M1, GC, cioè V  
 11 sopra] sey sonno li veri e perfecti segi de Napoli ut infra notata add. V || segi] che so  
 stansia di riposo add. PL || si] che F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 12 subscripte] soprascripte E ||  
 lo segio de] om. V || chyamato per] da PL, E 12-13 la altecza] la tercza GC 13 anche]  
 antiquo V || anche è chyamata] dicto PL, E || Salito (P1)] Solito M1 || Aula] ala P2 ||  
 Fori] forte GC, et questo sia decto dila prima piacza add. PL 13-14 El secundo segio  
 si è] ala secondo piacza PL, E, et lo secundo è P3, chiamato add. P2 14 si è lo segio]  
 om. GC || che è ... strata] om. PL, E 15 posto] om. P2 || el terczo ... quillo] lu segio  
 PL, alla terza piazza el segio E 16 socto] om. N1 17 de San] om. P1, F, SN2, P3 ||  
 la quale ... lo] primo PL, E || primo lo templo] lo primo templo V || facto ad honore]  
 om. SN1 18 El quarto ... quillo] om. PL, E 19-20 fece ... quale] om. E 19 primo]  
 secundo V 20 innansi ... chyaramente] inanzi facemo mencione E, ferremo mencione  
 in del procedere del libro PL 21 mercato] e vindianosse le mercantie add. PL || la  
 ecclesia de] om. E 22 stane] fo SN1 22-181.1 hedificato ... Apollo] om. SN1

Apollo. El quinto segio è quillo de Capuana chyamato cossi per la porta de Capuana per la quale se va ad Capua. El sexto segio si è quello de Nido lo quale stane ad presso la porta Ventosa socto la quale per la habundancia dell'acqua et delle padule como è dicto de sopra paria che fosse lo Nilo lo quale è uno grande fyume de Egipto. Alo quale luoco de Nido se dice che  
 5 vi fosse una ymagine de marmore co una dompna yscolpita che nutrica cinco infantini suoy figlyoli: tre ne stanno da parte dericta et duy de la sinistra. Et inpercio che ène luoco dove covano li aucelli volgaremente se chyama Nido et maximamente per la habitacione de li scolari li quali habitanno in uno luoco vicino alo dicto segio alo quale luoco per la dicta  
 10 habitacione è nido de scolari. La gente che so venute da poy li possero nomo lo Scoluso cio è uso de scola et stancia de scolari.

## 15

*In the extension of the city created by the three Palaepolitans were founded the seggi of Portanova and later Porto. Classical authors referred to Naples  
 15 as "otiosa," and Seneca spoke of its great learning.*

Indela aiunsione facta indela dicta cita per li dicti gentili homine cio è Albino, Avorio et Dompno Pietro et loro sequaci da poy fo facto lo segio de Porta Nova per la porta nova facta inella cita a cio che se potesse avere la insuta ala fortellecze de Avorio et de suoy sequace facti novi  
 20 vicini et citadini. Et de poy fo facto lo segio o viro placza de Porto cossi chyamata da lo porto de mare indela quale è la stancia de le nave et altri

1 El quinto ... quillo] lu segio PL, E 1-2 chyamato ... Capuana] om. P1, F, V, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, P3 || chyamato ... ad] dicto dala porta di PL, drito alla porta de E 2 Capua] cosi clamato add. V || El sexto ... quello] alla terza piazza lu segio PL, il segio E 2-3 lo quale stane] sovra PL, E 4 de sopra] om. PL, E || paria] om. V || Nilo] Nido P3 5 uno ... de] in P2 || de Nido] om. PL, E 6 una] piu P2 || yscolpita] om. PL, E || nutrica] notricava SN1 7 cinco] ovvero cieba PL || infantini] faciulli E, infantini soi GC || ne stanno] om. PL, E, ne stavano SN1 || da parte dericta] ad canto ricto P2 || duy de] stanno da la parte add. N1 7-8 la sinistra] parte manca PL, E 8 ène] era SN1, il PL, E || covano] om. N1, P1, P3, cavavano V, erano SN1, sono F, P2, gubano GC || aucelli] dove add. N1, P1, P2, SN2, P3, che add. SN1, P2 8-9 volgaremente ... Nido] om. V, impero quel segio e la piazza è chiamata Nido add. PL 9 chyama] chiamavano SN1 9-10 li quali habitanno] habitatino PL, habitando E, li quali habitano F, N1, P2, GC, SN2, li quali habitavano SN1, P3 10 vicino] verso E 11 Nido] o uso add. PL || che so venute da poy] che socciese ala gente prima PL, quale successe E || venute] che so venuti add. V 12 è] om. P1 || et stancia de scolari] o di scolari PL, de scolari E 13 tit. add. SN2, P3 17 dicti] dicti tre PL, tre E || cio è] om. PL 18 Albino] Allino F || et loro] elegero GC || fo] om. N1 19 per ... nova] om. P1, E, P2, SN1 21 vicini et] om. PL || citadini] citani E || fo] om. GC 22 indela quale] che la PL 22-182.1 è la stancia ... vi] om. GC || et altri ... veneno] om. PL, E, et altri ligni che la venevano SN1



ligni chi vi veneno. Habenga Dio che non sia ben sicuro per li venti et habenga che alcuni antiqui auturi Napoli sia represa per troppo ocio et riposo. Et è Ovidio un di colloro el quale fo de Pelligro chyamato Nasone; narrante la venuta de Enea in Ytalia l'a brevemente nominati li luochi per li quali passi. Se dice che navigando per Crapi et la Minerva et per li munti de Sorrento fertili de arbori fructiferi e Castello a.Mmare de Scabia hedificato da Hercoles et Parthonope nata in delo riposo et da quillo luoco s'ende andò ad Cume dove so l'acque calde etc. Et Oracio in VII° libro loquale se chyama Oracio o viro l'Ode de Oracio se dice nominando la uciosa Napoli. Ma non per tanto da multe probi homine è nominata et laudata de alta et nobele sciencia et specialmente da Senica in una delle soy pistole ove dice, Yo me vergognyo de la generatione humana quante volte in tray ala scola per li segi de Napoli. Et ipso Seneca alo quinto libro dele Questiuone naturale dice che in Napoli fo uno grande terramoto o viro tremulo luquale si sente multo in comone et poco in spciale o particolari.

## 16

*Florus described the beauties of Campania, and Eustazio da Matera described Naples. In the time when Emperor Octavian appointed Marcellus duke of Naples, Virgil served as Marcellus' advisor. They ordered underground aqueducts and public fountains to be built. Virgil wrote his Georgics here.*

Como lo inperatore Octaviano fece Marcello duca de Napoli et como Virgilio fundò le chyaveche in Napoli.

---

1 sia] è P<sub>1</sub>, F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || ben] troppo PL, E 2 habenga che] avenga Dio che da PL, V, avenga da E || sia] fo E, a F, P<sub>2</sub>, andò SN<sub>1</sub>, è SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 2-3 et riposo] om. P<sub>1</sub>, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, riposti SN<sub>1</sub> 3 Et è] zoè da PL, E, et SN<sub>1</sub> || un di colloro] unde chelloro N<sub>1</sub>, onde quillo SN<sub>1</sub>, onde colloro F, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, om. PL, E || el quale fo] om. E 4 narrante] narravi E || de (N<sub>1</sub>) et M<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>1</sub> || l'a] e PL, om. E || nominati] nominante PL || li luochi] gliochi E, liluo che F, GC, li luo P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub>, livio che SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 5 passi] passò PL, E || navigando] navicò E 6 fructiferi] et fortiferi SN<sub>1</sub> || de Scabia] pos. post "Ercules" SN<sub>1</sub>, che è add. N<sub>1</sub> 7 nata ... riposo] narrando li resposi GC 8 etc.] om. V || VII°] VI° N<sub>1</sub>, un PL, E 9 Oracio o viro] om. E || l'Ode de (N<sub>1</sub>)] lo dede P<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>1</sub>, F, lo dire de V, lidede GC, lo dette SN<sub>2</sub>, lo detto P<sub>3</sub> 10 uciosa] viciosa GC || non] om. SN<sub>1</sub> 11 et nobele] om. PL 13 ipso] ancora dicie che lassò Baya e pitiò Napoli et ipso add. PL 14 quinto] quarto PL, om. E || che in] de E || in (N<sub>1</sub>)] om. P<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>1</sub>, PL, GC, || fo] di PL, che E || grande] om. GC 15 tremulo] tremolicze V || o ... luquale] o tremolo PL, om. E 23-24 Como ... Napoli] tit. om. PL, P<sub>1</sub>, F, V, E, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub> 24 fundò ... Napoli] om. GC || chyaveche] che che sono add. SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>

Dice eciam dio Florio Agnyeo indela sua opera oscura sopre Titolivio non solamente de Ytalia ma de tucto lo mundo la pyu bella provincia è quella de Canpagnya per che ad nulla parte lo celo è pyu temperato dove florischino duy volte li arbore; niuno territorio se trova pyu fertele in cose acte ad Baccho et ad Venus, no è nelo mundo meglyo mare da porto de nave et d'omne altro lignyo. Ivi è quillo nobele porto de Gayeta et quillo de Missino o de Baya con fontane de acque calde et lo lago de Averno cola gran casa de la Sibilla che per le vicende piglyano lo mare. Ivi et graciusi colli, Somma, Falerno, Massicano, lu quale monte de Summa pyu bello de tucti vicini con duy capi gecta foco como lo monte de Acthena. In dele cita ad presso lo mare fundate Cuma, Piczulo, Herculano, de Ponpeyo. El capo de tucte le cita de Canpagnya si fo Capua indelo tempo passato posta nel cuncto de le tre cita cioè Roma, Cartagine, et Capua. Per la quale cita de Capua lo popolo romano si assaltò lo popolo beneventano etc. Et Eustasio de la Pianta de Ytalia clarissimo poeta et autore dice de Napoli, la inclita Napoli generosa ornata de gracie in nomo Parthenope cossi nominata da Parthonope cita riale multo famosa; et recita multi altri loche che in quillo tempo vi foro, de le quale volesse Dio che v'ende fosse remaso la tercza parte ali suoy citadini.

1 oscura] *om. PL*, o scura *V* 2 è] et *P1*, de *GC* 3 nulla] niuna *E, V* || lo] del *SN2*, *P3* 4 niuno] in uno *GC* 5 è ... mundo] se truova *PL* 5-6 mare ... lignyo] mare da riscistere per navilii *PL*, porto de mare per le navi *E* 6 d'omne (*N1*)] donne *M1*, de mone *P1* || ivi] là *N1, SN2, P3*, qui si *SN1*, cio *GC* || ivi ... de] perche vi sono quey nobili porti zo è *PL*, et in quei porti zioè *E* || porto] *om. GC* || Gayeta] Payeta *V* 6-8 et quillo ... Sibilla] e Miseno fontane di acque calde di Baya Lucerno et Averno *PL*, vi sono fontane de aque calde et de Baia, Lucerno, Averno *E* 7 de Missino o] *om. SN2, P3* || Missino] Missina *N1, GC*, Messina *V*, Messino *F, SN1* || con] et *N1* || lago] habo *N1*, lao *SN1* 8 vicende] *om. E* || mare] nome *V* 8-9 Ivi ... Somma] Gaulu *PL, E* 8 et] con li *V*, so *SN1, SN2, P3*, è *P2, om. GC* 9 Somma ... monte de] *om. P2, SN1* || Falerno (*PL*)] Salerno *M1, P1, F, N1, V, E, GC, SN2, P3* || lu ... Summa] et lu multo *PL, E* || Summa] summi *P2* 10 con duy capi] il qual *PL, E* || duy] lui *GC* || gecta] mena *PL* || como] *om. P2, GC* || Acthena] Ethna *E* || in dele] le *PL, E*, yvi la *V* 11 fundate] formade *PL*, son dite *E*, funnata *SN1*, fo data *GC* || Piczulo] piccola *N1*, picchola *PL* || Herculano] et Colano *N1*, Napoli Herculano *PL, E* || Ponpeyo] Pompcio *N1* 12 capo] campo *N1* || de Canpagnya si fo] *om. PL* 13 posta ... tre] contata inter le tre *PL*, contata et nominata intro le altre *E* || cuncto] canto *P2* || cioè] *om. PL, E*, cio *P1* || et Capua] *om. PL* 14 de Capua] *om. GC* || si assaltò] si exaltò *N1*, assagliò *PL*, || lo ... beneventano] li beneventani *PL, E* 15 etc.] *om. V, SN1, GC* || pianta] pianeta *V* || clarissimo (*PL*)] carissimo *M1, P1, F, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3* || de] *om. SN1, P2* 16 generosa] nanti *PL, E*, graciosa *V* || gracie] gente *PL* 16-17 in nomo ... da] *om. N1* 17 cossi ... Parthonope] *om. SN1* || nominata] dicta *PL* || multo famosa] *om. PL* 18 loche] lode *PL, V, E* || de le quale] *om. N1* || v'ende] vi dede *V*, uno ne *SN1* 19 remaso] *om. PL* || ali] altri *GC*

## 17B

Illaqual cita di Napoli Virgilio multo  
 piu chiaro di tucti i poeti non puo  
 tacere impero che vi fo ufficiale e scrip-  
 since il libro dila Georgica. 5

Et quando Octaviano inperatore de Roma ordinao Marcello duca de li  
 napolitani indelo tempo de quil Marcello essendo consiglyario et quasi  
 rectore suo o vero maystro homo sagace et dissipulo delle muse chyamato  
 Virgilio mantuano si foro facte socto terra le chyaveche indela cita de  
 Napoli avendo curso alo mare et li puczi prubiche per le strate maystre 10  
 con conducti d'acqua per deverse vie et soctili artificio. Le quale acque  
 congregate in uno alto de uno montecello chyamato Sancto Pietro ad  
 Cancellaria correno ale fontane publiche facte et hedificate indela dicta  
 cita per la sagacitate de lo dicto Marcello et per preghera de lo dicto  
 Virgilio. Lo imperatore Octaviano chyamò Napoli dompna de nove cita 15  
 oppido o vero castello murato.

Lo quale Virgilio nela predicta cita  
 scripsi lo libro de la Georgica nel  
 tempo quando Octaviano ordinò Mar-  
 cello duca de li napolitani. 20

## 17 (18B)

*Virgil used his magic arts to forge a golden fly that rid Naples of its flies. It  
 was located in the Castel Capuana, but when moved to the Castel Cicala  
 [in Nola], it lost its powers.*

Qui si narra como Virgilio fece la mosca in Napoli. 25

Indela quale cita per lo ayro delle padule le quale a.lley so propinque  
 inello tempo li era grande habondancia de mosche in tanto che quasi

---

2 illaqual] de la qual E 3 chiaro] caro E 6 Et] in tempo PL, E || inperatore de  
 Roma] om. PL, E 7 indelo tempo] om. V 9 mantuano] di Mantoya PL || socto terra]  
 pos. post "curso" PL || chyaveche] chiave che P1, F, chiavi N1, chiave che è P2, cave PL,  
 E, chiaveche che SN2, P3 9-10 indela ... Napoli] om. PL, E || de Napoli] om. SN2,  
 P3 10 puczi] pigii? GC || prubiche] propinqui N1, prubi che F, V, P2 || per] om. GC ||  
 per ... maystre] om. PL, E 11 con] om. E, SN1, P2, GC || et] et con PL, E, V, con SN1 ||  
 le quale acque] om. PL, E 12 uno] in uno add. V || alto] altro P1 13 facte et] om.  
 SN1 15 Octaviano] om. N1, SN2, P3 || chyamò] om. E || nove cita] nave cita P1, Roma  
 cita V, novelitate SN1 16 oppido] om. E || o vero] om. GC 21 Cap. 16 et 17 uniti SN1  
 25 Tit. om. PL, P1, F, V, E, P2, SN1 26 le] del N1 || le quale ... propinque] om. PL, E ||  
 so] erano F, SN1 27 quasi] quali PL, E

generavano mortalita. Et lo sopradicto Virgilio per la grande affeccione la quale avea ala dicta cita et li soy citadini si fe per arte di nigromancia una mosca de oro et fella si forgiare grande quanto una rana sub certi puncti de stelle. Che per la efficacia et vertu dela quale moscha tucte le musche create nela cita fugiano secundo che Alixandro dice in una sua opera che illo vide la predicta moscha in una fenestra de lo Castello de Capuana et Gervasi in dela sua coronica la quale se intitula Li risposi inperiali proba questa cosa fosse stata cossi. Da poy la dicta moscha, levata da quillo luoco et portata alo Castello de Cicali, si perdiò la vertu.

18 (19B)

10

*Virgil made a magic leech that, thrown into a well, rid Naples of all its leeches.*

Como Virgilio fece la sanguezuca in delle acque.

Et eciam dio fece fare Virgilio una rana o viro sanguesuca che alo presente cossi è chyamata de oro formata sub certe costellazione la quale fo gictata alo profundo de uno puczo. Per la efficacia et vertu de la quale sanguesuca tucte le sanguesuche forono scaczate dell'acque de la cita de Napoli lequale ne habundavano grande quantitate et como mo alo presente manifestamente nuy vidiamo operante la divina gracia senza laquale nisuna cosa se pote fare perfecta, la predicta gracia et vertu dura per fine alo di de ogi et dura in eternum.

---

1 Et lo sopradicto] el quale V || affeccione] offensione N1 3 si] om. N1, F, V, PL, E, P2, SN1, SN2, P3 || puncti] pianeti PL 4 stelle] die V || Che] om. GC || Che per ... dela] per la V || per] om. F, SN2, P3 || et vertu] om. E 5 create] cicale E, om. SN1 || dice] om. P1, PL, parla F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3 || in una] om. E || opera] actesta add. PL 6 illo] lla GC || vide (P1)] vede M1, F, V, SN1, vedecte N1 7 Li risposi] Li riposi V, PL, om. E 8 fosse] essere N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3 || moscha] fo add. V 8-9 quillo luoco] là PL 9 Castello de Cicali] de de sigilia GC 13 Tit. om. PL, P1, F, V, E, P2, SN1 14 eciam dio] anche E || Virgilio] om. PL, E; fece fare add. SN1 || rana o viro] certa PL, E 14-15 che ... chyamata] om. PL, E, et facta add. P2, SN1 15 formata] forata P1 || costellazione] stellaciune SN1, de stelle add. N1, PL, E, SN2, P3 || la quale] om. E 16 efficacia] effitia P1 || et vertu] e sua vertu pos. post "sanguesuca" E 17 tucte le] altre add. E || tucte ... sanguesuche] om. V; GC || dell'acque] da quelle acque et P2 || dell'acque ... cita] om. E, dale fontane SN1 18 ne habundavano] erano F, SN1 18-20 ne habundavano ... laquale] om. P2 18 grande quantitate] in grande copia PL, in grandissima quantita E || mo] om. F, SN1, SN2, P3 18-19 alo presente] om. PL, E 19 nuy] om. N1 || operante] operare E 20 nisuna ... predicta] om. GC || et vertu] om. SN2, P3 21 per] om. N1 || alo ... ogi] a questo midesimo tempo PL || dura] durera F, N1, V, PL, E, P2, SN1, SN2, P3 || eternum] se a Dio piacera add. F, P2

## 19 (20B)

*Virgil made a metal horse that cured all sick horses, but jealous horse doctors punctured its stomach and it lost its power. In 1322 it was melted down to make the cathedral bells. It is believed that the seggi of Capuana and Nido take their coats of arms from this horse. Marvelling at these coats of arms, King Charles I composed verses about dominating the untamed horse.* 5

Anche lo dicto Virgilio fece forgiare uno cavallo de metallo socto costellazione de stelle che per la visione sola de lo cavallo o sulo per seli approssimare l'altri cavalli stimolati de alcuna infirmitate se aveano remedio 10 de sanita. Lo quale cavallo li miniscalchi de la cita de Napoli avendo de cio gran dolore inpercio che non aveano guadagnyo alle cure deli cavalli infirme si andaro una nocte et perforarolo in ventre da poy dela quale percussione o roctura lo predicto cavallo perdiò la virtute. Unde 15 de poy fo convertito ala costruzione delle canpane dele maiure ecclesie de Napoli in delo anno de nostro signyore Ihu xpo Mille CCC XXII lo quale cavallo si stava colcato indela corte de la predicta maiore ecclesia de Napoli. Da lo quale cavallo se crede che la placza o viro segio de Capuana porte l'arme o viro la insignya, cio è uno cavallo in colore d'oro senza freno. Per la quale cosa quando lo serenissimo principe re Carlo 20 primo intrao in dela cita de Napoli maraviglyandose dell'arme de questa placza et de la placza de Nido laquale anco per arme ave uno cavallo

1 *Tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 8 Anche] *om. E*, ancora *PL* 8–14 Anche ... virtute] *demicapitulum pos. prae cap. 18(19B) E* 8 lo dicto Virgilio] *om. PL, E* || fece] etiam *add. E* || socto] sopra certa *E*, so certi *PL* 9 che] *om. PL, SN1* || la] sua *add. P2* 9–10 sulo ... approssimare] appressimandose *F, P2*, seli appressimare *SN1* 9 per] *om. PL* || seli] *om. V*, fargli *E* 10 de] *om. P1* || infirmitate] malattia *E* || se] dentro lo corpo d'ogni una infirmita *PL* 11 sanita] et finalmente erano curati *add. PL* || de Napoli] *om. PL* 11–12 avendo de cio] stimolati di *PL*, avendone *F, P2* 12 aveano] haveano nullo *SN2, P3*, potevano conseguire *PL* || alle cure] *om. F, P2* 13 infirme] infine *GC* || si andaro ... perforarolo] una nocte sil perforarono *PL* 13–14 delaquale] per la ditta *SN2* 13–15 dela quale percussione ... poy] *repet. M1* 14 percussione] perforatura *E* || roctura] vinctura *V* 14–15 unde de] *repet* || unde da poy] dil metallo dilo qual cavallo *PL*, e lo metallo del sopradicto cavallo *E* 15 fo] ala *add. P1* || convertito] convertito *V*, convertito e meschiato *PL* || costruzione] et operatione *add. PL* 16 de nostro ... xpo] *om. PL*, del Signore *E* 17 si stava] era *E* || colcato] collo capo *V*, guardato *PL, E* || de la predicta] maiore *GC* || maiore] *om. SN1* 18 Da] *om. V* || o viro segio] *om. PL, E*, alo sezo *P2* 20 freno] et la placza di Nido un cavallo di colo nigro senza freno *add. in margine inferiore PL* || lo ... principe] *om. V* 21 primo] sovranominato *add. PL* || Napoli] pigliata *add. PL* 21–187.1 questa placza ... freno si] le dicte piacze *PL* 22 anco] *om. E*, per l'arme de questa placza lo quale *add. GC* || per arme ave] porta et have per arme *V* || ave] avea *F, P3*

tucto nigro senza freno si comandò che fossero scripte duy versi li quali in questa forma dessero:

Rex domat hunc equus parthonopensis equum  
Actenus effrenis nunc freni paret actenis.

De li quali versi la sentencia in vulgare si è questa: che lo re iusto de Napoli 5  
doma quisto cavallo isfrenato, et ali homine senza freno li apparechya le  
retene de lo freno.

20 (21B)

*Virgil made a bronze grasshopper that rid Naples of all grasshoppers and  
their disturbing noise.* 10

Eciamdio quillo sopradicto carissimo poeta si fece fare una cicala o viro  
cantatrice de rame per arte de nigromancia incantata et si la appicò ad  
uno arbore co una catinella per la efficacia et virtute de la quale cicala  
si fugereno da la dicta cita tucte le cicale lequale erano tante infestante  
et contrarie ali citadine per loro bructo cantare che quasi non poteano 15  
de nocte dormire ne pusare. Et la dicta gracia dura per fine alo dì de ogi  
che da quillo tempo in qua, no sence trova nè auditi niuna quanto gira lo  
circuyto delle mura della predicta cita in niuno tempo.

21 (22B)

*Virgil hung charmed meat in the Old Market so that meat sold there was 20  
preserved a long time and not spoiled by the southern winds.*

1 tucto nigro] nero pure E 1-2 fossero ... dessero] se scrivesseno questi duo versi  
PL, fossero scripti doi versi in questa sotoscripta forma E 3-4 Rex ... actenis] om. P1,  
F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 3 domat hunc] de con achua GC || equum] equus PL, E, cisu GC  
4 effrenis] et frenis V, et frenus GC, et fiertis E || freni] frenis V, fieri GC, fremi SN1 ||  
paret] parat PL, om. E || actenis] habenis V, PL, E 5 re] om. V 6 doma] dona  
P2, donna GC || isfrenato] frenato E, infrenato GC || et] che da per fi mo PL, om. SN2,  
P3 || ali homine] alcuni E || apparechya] apparichiava GC 7 retene] cathene (cum  
"o retene" add. super lineam) SN1 || de lo] senza N1, et lo P2 8 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3  
11 carissomo] clarissimo V, PL, E, P2, SN1 12 appicò] lighò PL, E 13 efficacia et] gran  
PL || quale] dicta F, P2 14 cita] de Napoli add. F, P2 || tucte le] altre add. E || lequale]  
nansi di questa cicala add. PL 14-15 tante ... citadine] multo nocive et dispiacevole ali  
napolitani F, P2 14 infestante] infectati GC 15 quasi non] scarsamente PL 16 de  
nocte] om. SN1 || ne pusare] nisi posareno N1, ne reposare E, et riposarese PL || et] de?  
GC, om. N1 16-18 et la dicta gracia ... tempo] om. PL 17-18 che da quillo tempo ...  
tempo] om. E 17 trova] trovavano GC || nè auditi] ne ode F, N1, P2, P3, SN2, om. V, SN1  
|| niuna] cicala add. F, P2 || gira] dura F, P2 18 delle mura] om. P1, F, N1, P2, P3, SN2 ||  
niuno] GC || tempo (N1)] templo M1, P1 19 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3

Niente meno volendo lo dicto Virgilio provedere ala utilitate de quilli li quali sentivano dampno multe volte indela carne fresca et salata inpercio che spisse volte feteva per uno vento austro loquale ala dicta cita è multo contrario et inpercio che quando ley soffiava se corronpeyano le dicte carne. Per la quale cosa lo dicto Virgilio fece appendere deverse pecze de 5 diverse carne per la sopradicta arte magica in uno arco ala bozcaria de la piazza de lo mercato vecchyò dove in quello tempo se vendeva la carne. Per la vertu de la quale carne appesa per Virgilio, tucta la carne che restava che vendere no se poteva si se conservava per pyu dì et semmane senza 10 corruccione et la carne salata se conservava gran tempo senza macula niuna.

## 22 (23B)

*Virgil made a bronze trumpeter that blew back the harmful April winds and left the fruits and trees to reach perfect maturity.*

Per lo vento lo qualè chiyamato Favorio o viro Furano lo quale vento 15 guasta li arbori et commonemente sole ventare ala intrata de lo mese de aprile nela dicta cita et è distrugitivo de le frunde et fyure et fructi tenderi deli arbori, el supradicto summo poeta fece forgiare una ymagine de rame

---

1 Niente meno] in questo tempo *E* || dicto] poeta cio è *add. V* || provedere] *om. V* || ala] dicta cita *add. GC* 2 sentivano] senza *N1*, senttano *SN1* || dampno] impercio *GC* || et] in la carne *add. V*, anche *add. SN1* 3 spisse volte] multi fiata *N1* || feteva (*V*)] faceva *P1, M1, F, N1, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, P3* || uno (*P1*)] bono *M1* || vento] chiamato *add. P3* 4 che ... soffiava] *om. PL, E* || ley] el vento *P2*, le vento predicto *F, SN1* 5 per ... Virgilio] egli *PL*, Virgilio *E* || fece] ponere et *add. PL* || appendere ... pecze] apprehendere *GC* || deverse] parichi *E* 6 diverse] *om. F, P2, SN1* || carne] hordinate *add. F, P2, SN1* || bozcaria de la] *om. E* 7 in quello] lo quale *M1, P1, N1, SN2, P3*, in quale? *GC* || carne] et anche mo si vende *add. PL, E*, appesa *add. SN1* 8 Per la] efficacie et *add. PL* || la vertu ... carne] *om. P2* 8-10 la quale ... la] li quali peczi di carne, ogni carne *PL*, li quali pezi la carne frescha *E* 9 che vendere ... poteva] ad vendere *N1, SN2, P3*, ad vendere non puczava ma *F, P2, SN1, om. E*, ala beccharia *add. PL* || vendere no] venderono se *GC* 9-10 conservava per ... se] *om. GC* 9 dì et] giorni e forsi *PL* 10 corruccione (*P2*)] correccione *P1, M1, N1*, corruzione *V* || corruccione et] non pigliava altro colore ni odore o vero sapore e *add. PL* || et la carne ... macula] *om. SN1* || salata] per le casi *add. PL* || conservava] servava *E*, conservare *GC* 10-11 gran ... niuna] per tre anni et piu *PL*, per tre anno o piu *E* 11 niuna] veruna *F* 12 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 15 qualè ... Furano] qual se chiama o Furano *PL*, il qual se chiama Favonio *E* || Favorio] Favigno *SN1* || lo quale vento] in qual *PL*, che *E* 16 arbori] laburi *PL* || de lo mese] *om. PL, E* 17 è] *om. GC* || è distrugitivo] distrugitore *V*, destruccione *E* || fyure et] *om. E* || tenderi] tenenti *E*, caddere *GC* 18 el] et lo *P1, F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3* || summo] *om. F, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, P3*

socto certi signi et conioncione de pianete. Laquale ymagine tenea una tromba in boccha laquale percossa o spenta da lo dicto vento Favorio per la vertu dele dicte pianete da la tromba insia uno altro vento contrario alo dicto Favorio alo quale era de necessitate de tornarese indereto. Per la quale cosa li arbori et fructi cresseano senza nocimento et perveniano 5 ad ammaturatione perfecta.

## 23 (24B)

*To aid the sick with healing herbs that are difficult to find, Virgil created a garden at the base of Monte Vergine. The garden reveals itself to those who come to heal the sick, but not to those who come to destroy the herbs 10 or plant them elsewhere. Even today herbs are found there that grow in no other place.*

Volendo ancho lo exemio auctore et summo poeta providere ale infirmitate de li homine conn.erbe salutifere et medicinale le quale bisogniano per li suchi et per li sciroppi, le quale herbe in multe parte de lo mundo 15 non se trovavano et maximamente la state, unde a.ppie o viro socto la montagna ove è la ecclesia de Sancta Maria de Monte Vergene sopra Avelle presso de Mercuglyano lu quale monte alo presente è chiamato Monte Vergene per le maraviglyose suoy arti et ingegnye fece ordinare uno iardino maraviglyoso et fertile de omne generazione de herbe. Lo- 20 quale iardino o viro orto actucti quilli che nce andavano per coglyere herbe per le cure delle infirmi le herbe et la via se dimostrava levemente. Et quilli che nce andavano per destrugerelle o per farele siccare o per

---

1 et ... pianete] *om.* SN1 || conioncione] coniuaciuni N1, cognitioni P2, condiciune GC, commocione SN2, P3 || ymagine] *om.* E 2 percossa o spenta da] per cosa aspenta da V, intrandoce dentro F, P2, introduce intro SN1 || Favorio] *om.* F, SN1 3 dele dicte pianete] *om.* E || da ... insia] facia ventare PL, sua E 4 dicto] vento *add.* E || Favorio] Favigno SN1 || alo quale] alo P1, de che F, N1, SN2, P3, che SN1 || de necessitate ... tornarese] necessario che tornasse P3 5 arbori (V)] lavori PL, M1, F, N1, SN2, lanari P1, lauri E, *illeg.* GC || nocimento] detrimento E 6 ad ammaturatione] et admiratione GC 7 *tit.* *add.* N1, SN2, P3 13 Volendo] [ ]dendo SN1 || ancho] ancora PL, E, V, SN2, P3 || auctore ... summo] et summo dili PL, *om.* E, et sommo auctore GC 13-14 infirmitate] salute F, P2, SN1 14 bisogniano] bisogniano P1, N1, PL, E, V, GC 15 per li] *om.* PL, E 16 trovavano] trovano PL, P1, F, N1, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, P3 || la state] citate E || unde] *om.* PL, E || a.ppie] appendi N1 || viro] non *add.* P1 17 montagna ... Maria] schiappa PL, E || ove] unde GC || sopra] sotto P3 18 Avelle] Avellino GC || alo presente] mo PL, *om.* E, SN1, adesso P2 || è chiamato] se chiama PL, E, 20 iardino] o vero orto *add.* PL, E 21 o viro orto] *om.* E || actucti] et tucta V 21-23 che nce andavano ... quilli] *om.* GC 22 per ... herbe (V)] *om.* M1 || le cure delle] li crudeli P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || cure] et rimedio *add.* PL, E 23 nce andavano] mandavano V || destrugerelle ... per] dissipare e E || per farele] *om.* PL



levarene le dicte herbe per pastenare altrove, non se lassavano vedere et meno trovavano may dove ce potessero andare. Indelo quale iardino eciamdio per fine alo nostro tempo vi se coglyeno herbe de grande virtute et medecinale le quale non se trovano alcune in altro luoco se non in quillo iardino.

5

## 24 (25B)

*Because Naples' harbor was shallow and had few fish, Virgil carved a fish in a rock at the place now called the "fish rock". As long as it remained there, fish great and small never lacked.*

Ancora vedendo lo predicto poeta la dicta cita, la quale con grande 10  
volunta desiderava de se magnificare per fama et per recchecza, recercava  
in omne acto et modo grandi et piczoli utile che ley potea fareli. Laquale  
cita non era fertele de pesse per lo poco fundo de lo mare. Volendo pro-  
vedere ala utilita deli cittadini fece laborare una petra et fecene intagliare  
uno pissetello bene scolpito. Lo quale lo fece fabricare in quillo luoco 15  
dove ogi se chyama la Petra de lo Pesse alo quale loco finche vi stecte  
la dicta petra iammay non mancò che non ne fosse de lo pesse grosso o  
minutulo quando in poco quantita et quando in multa copia.

## 25 (26B)

*At the Nolan Gate, Virgil sculpted two human heads, a laughing man and 20  
a weeping woman. If a man entering the city by this gate turned toward the  
laughing man, all his affairs in the city were successful. If he turned toward*

1 pastenare] portarle E || altrove] in altra parte SN1 2 meno] non ci PL, E, niente non de V, ne manco SN1, niuno GC || trovavano] trovare SN1 || may] via add. PL, E 2-3 eciamdio] om. SN1 3 fine] mo add. V || coglyeno] coglievano SN2, P3 3-4 herbe ... medecinale] herbe medicinale et virtuosissime PL, molie medicinale et virtuosissime herbe E, de multe herbe de gran vertu medicinale V 4 non] om. GC || trovano] trovavano P1, SN2, P3 || alcune] om. SN1 || alcune ... luoco] alcuno altro loco GC 5 iardino] om. E, tit. capituli 24 add. N1 6 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 10 Ancora] allora N1, SN2, P3 || vedendo] venendo N1, udendo V, volendo SN1 || la quale] repet. 11 desiderava] om. V || de se magnificare] se magnificasse P2, che se magnificasse F, SN1, SN2, P3 11-12 recercava in] recerva GC 12 in omne ... fareli] om. PL, E || utile] che e in fertile add. V || che ley potea] lo poeta GC 12-13 laquale cita] che PL, E 13 mare] che sta dipresso Napoli add. PL, che stava dapresso Napoli add. E 14 fecene] fecerene P1 15 bene ... fece] e fello PL, E 16 dove ... loco] om. E || ogi] mo PL, V || Pesse] e dalu dicto pescie li fo imposto lo nomo la Pietra dilo Pescie add. PL || finche] donfin che P2 17 non] om. GC || che ... fosse] om. E || non] om. P3 17-18 grosso o minutulo] grande o piccolo N1, SN2, P3, de omne ragione SN1 18 poco quantita] poca poca V || in multa] axai F 19 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3

*the weeping woman, his affairs failed. The sculptures still exist at this gate, now called Forcella.*

Indela intrata de la dicta cita sopra la Porta Nolana concorrendono ad ipso le mirabile influencie de le pianete fece mirabelemente hedificare et inscolpire duy teste humane per fine alo pecto de marmore l'una de homo 5 allegro che rideva et l'altra de dompna trista che piangea avendo diversi augurie et effecti. Se alcuno homo trasiva ala dicta cita per optinere alcuna gracia o per spedire alcuna sua facenda et casualmente declinava ala sua intrata da lo lato de la porta dove stava lo homo o ymagine che redea, consequitava bono aguro et tucto suo desiderio avea bono effecto 10 in tucte soy facende. Se inclinava ala intrata da lo lato de la porta dove era la testa che piangeva omne male aguro era et nisuno spazamento le advenia nelle soy facende. Le quale ymagine fino alo di de oggi si apparenno sopra ala dicta porta laquale alo presente chyamata è la Porta de Forcella.

26 (27B)

15

*Virgil organized annual games at Carbonara, not with fatalities as happened later but to train men in weaponry. The place is called Carbonara because dead animals and the garbage of the charcoal makers was thrown here. Virgil also created four human skulls which told the duke of Naples all the news of the four parts of the world.*

20

Et in quillo tempo anche ordinao che omne anno se facesse el ioco de Carbonara non con morte de homine como fo facto de poy, ma cio fece per exercitare li homine ali facti dell'arme. Et in quillo tempo se donavano certi doni ad quilli chi erano venciture. El dicto ioco habe principio dal

---

3 intrata ... cita] dicta cita sula intrata P2 || concorrendono] incorrendono N1, P3, SN2, soccorrendo PL, E 4 ipso] essere N1 || mirabile ... pianete] om. V || mirabelemente] maravegliosamente SN1 6 trista che] che tristò et V 8 alcuna] om. P3, SN2 || declinava] inclinava SN1 9 intrata] intrare SN1 || lato] loco V 10 bono] lomo V, om. E 11 facende] ma add. N1, P3 || inclinava] declinava PL, E || ala intrata] alo intrare SN1, om. SN2 || ala ... da lo] allo P3 || ala ... lato] dallintrata o lato PL, da la parte E || da ... porta] con lo lito della pietra V 12 era] ora V || omne] onde P2 || aguro era] om. PL, E, augurio li sequitava F, P2, SN1 || et nisuno] in suo V, GC || spazamento] expeditamento SN2, expediente P3, bono add. F, P2, SN1 13 nelle ... oggi] om. P1 13-14 Le quale ... Forcella] om. PL, E 15 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 21 anche] ancora PL, E, el dicto poeta add. F, P2, SN1 || omne anno] om. F, P2, SN1 || se facesse] om. GC || ioco] foco P1, F, N1, loco E 22 Carbonara] carnevale GC || cio fece] om. PL, E 23 exercitare] excitare V || homine] giovini PL, E || ali] et li P1 || ali facti] in lo mestiere F, in el mistero P2 || in ... tempo] om. PL, E || donavano] faceano F, P2, SN1 24 certi] li P2 || habe] dello V 24-192.1 dal menare] om. SN1

menare dele mela, range, o viro citrangola del quale da poy soccese lo  
 menare delle prete, da poy coli bastune. Viro è ca nce andavano colo  
 capo coperto de ferro o viro da coyro. Da poy pyu nanci neli anni de  
 lo nostro signyore Ihu xpo M CCC LXXX de quilli che nce iocavano  
 non obstante che se armavano de infenite arme multi c'ende moriano. 5  
 Et quillo loco è chyamato Carbonara inpercio che là se solevano gictare  
 le bestie morte et la mondataura de li carbuni. Anche ordinò lo predicto  
 Virgilio in dela dicta cita per sua arte magica quactro capi humani che  
 longo tempo innanti morti erano stati. Liquali capo davano vera risposta  
 de tucte li facti che se facevano in dele quactro parti de lo mundo ad cio 10  
 che tucti li facti de lo mundo fossero manifestate alo duca de Napoli.

## 27 (28B)

*Virgil placed a seal on a certain stone at the Nolan Gate which enclosed and  
 killed all the snakes. Even now the only snakes in Naples are those brought  
 in accidentally in straw or hay. (Biographical information on Virgil and 15  
 description of his tomb outside Naples.)*

Anche indela dicta cita de Napoli ala predicta Porta Nolana, laquale alo  
 presente è chyamata la Porta de Forcella como è dicto de sopra, è una via  
 de preta artificiosamente constructa et ordinata, et ala dicta via posse uno  
 sigillo lo dicto Virgilio non sencza grande ministerio lo quale concluse et 20  
 annullò omne generacione de serpenti et de altri vermi nocivi. La quale

1 mela ... citrangola] mela rangi *F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3*, citrangola chon tali ferute di  
 fionde *PL, E* || da poy] *om. V* 2 da ... bastune] e po a  
 macze *PL, E* || viro ... andavano] ma stavano *PL, E* 3 de ferro o viro] chon bacincti  
 et elmi *PL, E* || pyu nanci] piu nasci *V, om. F, P2, SN1* || neli anni] poi la morte *N1, SN2,*  
*P3*, la incarnacione *F, P2, SN1* 3-4 neli anni ... xpo] venne al tempo digli anni *PL, E*  
 4 M] et *add. N1* || CCC] *CCCC P1* || LXXX] che *add. PL, E* 5 non obstante] *om. GC* ||  
 armavano ... arme] armassero lo capo ma se copriano tutto d'arme *SN2, P3* || de] che *V* ||  
 infenite] bone *F, P2, SN1* || infenite ... multi] tuct'arme infiniti *PL, E* || c'ende] gente *E,*  
*om. GC* 6 Et ... è] et in quillo loco *GC* || quillo loco] *om. PL, E* 6-7 inpercio ... la]  
 in delo quale luogho *PL*, perche in quel luoco *E* 6 solevano] soleno *N1* 7 et ... li]  
 mondecze et *PL, E* 7-8 lo ... Virgilio] *om. PL, E* 9 davano] doveano *SN1* 10 dele]  
 tutti li *SN2, P3* || dele ... parti] tucti li quactro capi *F, P2, SN1* 10-11 ad ... mundo]  
*repet. E, om. P2* 11 de lo] che se faceano al *GC* || manifestate] manifesti *P1, F, N1, PL,*  
*E, SN1, P2, SN2, P3* || duca] cita *SN1* 12 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 17 Anche] ancora *PL, E*  
 17-18 alo ... porta] mo se chiama *PL, E* 18 de] Nolana oviro Porta *V* || como ... sopra]  
*om. PL, E* || è] et *E* || via] vi pose Virgilio *add. V* 19 artificiosamente] *facta add. E, P2* ||  
 constructa] *om. P2* || posse uno] è un sigillo alu qual *PL, E* 20 sigillo] et *add. P1, M1,*  
*SN2, P3*, o *add. GC* || ministerio] misterio *F, P2, SN1, PL, E, GC* || lo quale] alo quale *F,*  
*P2, SN1*, lo *V, om. PL, E* || concluse] adusse *GC*

cosa per la divina misericordia in fine in qui nè osservato in tanto che per  
 nisuna cava di fundamenta de hedificio socta terra o vero per puczo o per  
 chyavecha may non fo trovato serpe ne altro verme nocivo vivo ne morto  
 excepto se con feno o strame ne fosse stato portato casualmente. Et ad  
 magisterio de doctrina de li napolitani nati in fertili patria et habundevole 5  
 stando ipso Virgilio in Napoli compose lo libro de la Georgica inelli anni  
 de la sua etate XXIII. In delo quale libro si insegnyano li modi como et  
 in quale tempo se debiano arare et cultivare li campi et seminareli et in  
 quale tempo se deveno li arbori plantare et taglyare et insertare secundo  
 che ipso actesta ala fine de la dicta opera dove dice, In quillo tempo 10  
 simme notricava la dolce Parthonope multo nobele in ocio et florido  
 indelo studio. Lu quale Virgilio per nazione lombardo habe principio de  
 una villa mantuana chyamata Pectaculo. El quale Virgilio fiori in fama  
 nelo tempo de Julio Cesaro socto Octaviano. In neli anni XXV delo suo  
 imperio la sua vita finiò inella cita de Brindisi unde de poy in poco tempo 15  
 fo racto lo suo corpo per li calabrisi et fo portato in Napoli et fo sepellito  
 alo capo de la grocta napolitana perforata per ipso Virgilio in quello  
 luoco ove è oggi una piczola ecclesiola chyamata Sancta Maria dell'Itria in  
 una sepultura ad piczolo templo quatrato frabecata de tecole ala antiqua  
 manera socto ad uno marmoro scripto et urnato lo suo epitafio de antiche 20

---

1 per la divina] Dio per la soa *PL, E*, gratia et *add. SN1* || in qui] ad mo *N1, SN2, P3*, in mo *PL, E*, al presente *F, P2, SN1* || nè osservato] ne è la cita conservata *F, P2*, nela cita è conservata *SN1*, l'osserva *PL, E* 2-3 nisuna ... chyavecha] cave e fossati facto socto terra per fare gli edifici e puczi *PL, E* 2 cava] causa *SN1* 3 chyavecha] frabica *F, P2, SN1*, cave che *GC* || may] *om. V* || ne] overo *P1* || vivo] *om. GC* 4 feno o strame] feno *V*, ligname o fieno *PL, E* || ne] non vi *F*, non *P2, SN2, P3* || stato] *om. N1, SN2, P3* || portato] alcuno *add. P1, N1, SN2, P3* || casualmente] *om. E* 5 magisterio de doctrina] doctrina e magiesterio *PL*, doctrina *E* || nati] nanti *P1*, non *V* 6 ipso Virgilio] *om. PL, E* || inelli anni] in del tempo *PL, E* 7 etate] vinctiquattro seu *add. P1* || XXIII] anni *add. V, E* || insegnyano] ingengiano *N1*, insegnavano *V* || como] *om. E* 8 cultivare] ordinare *V* || li campi] le terre sive *add. GC* 9 deveno] laborare *add. P2* || insertare] incertare *P1, F, N1*, insitare *SN1*, inserire *E*, inzetare *P2* 11 in ocio (*P1*)] in cio *M1, om. V* 12 indelo] *om. SN1* || Virgilio] fo *add. E* 13 mantuana] de Mantua *SN1* || chyamata] *om. V* || chyamata ... Virgilio] *om. E* || fiori] florido *SN1*, fiorite *E* || fama (*SN1*)] fyama *P1, M1, F, N1, GC*, summa *V* 14 XXV] XV *SN1, P2* 15 inella] sua *add. V* || Brindisi] Brandicio *E* || in ... tempo] in processo di tempo *V*, in successo de tempo *SN1, om. PL, E* 16 lo ... corpo] *om. PL, E* || calabrisi] choma chuosa multo delectevole *add. PL, E* 17 alo ... Virgilio] *om. PL, E* 18 è ... chyamata] se si chiama *PL*, mo se chiama *E* || ecclesiola] ecclesia *V, SN1, P2, GC* || chyamata] che se chiama *GC* || in] et *P1* 19 ad] o un *PL* || templo] tempo *N1, P2* || quatrato] chon quactro cantinii *add. PL, E* 19-20 ala antiqua manera] *om. PL, E*, al modo antiquo *SN1*, fo intieri et sano *add. V* 20 scripto et] de oro *add. V*

lictere. La quale marmora fo intiere et sana neli anni de lo nostro signyore Mille CCC XXVI nelo quale epitafio erano scripti duy versi liquali in sententia diceano:

Mantua me genero, li calabrisi me rapero, mo Napoli me tene.  
Lu quale scripsi la Boccholicha, la Georgica et lo Eneyda.

5

## 28 (29B)

*To shield the poor from rapacious physicians, Virgil built baths above the healing waters near Cumae, each accompanied by an image and inscription indicating which body part it healed. But the evil physicians of Salerno sailed there and destroyed all the inscriptions and some of the images. God* 10  
*punished the physicians by drowning all but one on their return voyage to Salerno.*

Considerò anche el dicto poeta eximio che in dela parte de Baya de presso ad Cuma erano l'acque calde avendo diversi cursi socto terra per le vene et materie de diverse operacione de sulfure et de lume et de argento 15 vivo secundo opinione de multi; le quale acque habondano de diverse virtute. Considerò adunque de là hedificare per la comone salute de li cittadini de Napoli et per utilitate de tucta la rey puplica hedificò multi et diversi bagnye et maximamente quillo bagnyo lu quale è chyamato Tritula. In nello quale bagnyo erano intaglyate et inscolpiti cotali ymagine 20 le quale co.lloro mano dissignyavano le infirmitate inpercio che ciasche uno al membro le soy mano tenea: chi alo capo, chi alo pecto, chi alo stomaco, chi alo ventre, chi ala cossa, et chi ali piede. Et sopra loro

1 intiere et] integro et N1, P2, om. PL, E || sana] facta E, ma add. V || neli anni] al tempo degli anni PL, om. E, del anni del anni V || de lo ... signyore] domini PL, del E, Jhu xpo add. SN1, GC 2 XXVI] VI E, XXVII P2 || erano scripti] om. GC || versi (P1)] om. M1 3 diceano] cosi add. E 4-5 Mantua ... Eneyda] om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 4 mo] ma V 5 scripsi] in versi add. PL, E 6 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 13 considerò] considerando PL || anche] ancora PL, E || eximio] om. F, SN2, P3 14 diversi] certi F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || cursi] om. V 14-15 vene et] bone E 15-16 sulfure ... multi] solfo zo è di alumi e di ferro, di pecie e di argento vivo PL, E 15 lume] alume F, SN1 16 habondano] habondavano PL, E, SN2, P3 || diverse] certi N1 17 considerò] consideraro N1 || adunque] om. F, P2 || de là] de vi V, da farevi PL, E, loro SN1, de le SN2 18 cittadini de Napoli] napolitani E || hedificò] om. PL, E, hedificio GC 19 bagnye] li quali se nominano infine del libro add. SN2, P3 || maximamente] specialmente hedificò F, P2 || è chyamato] se chiama PL, E 20 in nello] om. GC 20-195.2 bagnyo erano intaglyate ... magisterio] erano scripture tucti i nomi e virtude di tucte lacque specificatamente per sobtile magiesterio de fabriche designiate PL, E 20 cotali] sotto li GC 21 dissignyavano] inzegniavano F, inzegnano P2 22 al] ha el SN1

teste de lictere scolpiti et intaglyate ze erano insignyando li bagnye che  
 utili erano ale predicte infermitate facte con soctili magisterio aczo che  
 li poviri malati sencza adiuto et consiglyo de medici li quali sencza  
 alcuna caritate domandano essereno pagati potessero de la desiderata  
 sanita remedio trovare de le loro infirmitate. El quale bagnyo, remedio 5  
 dela poviri infirmi, li captivi medici de Salerno demonstraro la loro poco  
 caritate et grande loro iniquitate inpercio che una nocte navigaro da  
 Salerno per fine alo dicto bagnyo, et deguastaro tucte le scripture et parte  
 de le sopradicte ymagine con ferri et altri instrumenti da rompere li dicti  
 hedificii. Per la quale cosa la iusta et condegnya virtute de Dio li poniò 10  
 inpercio che como li dicti medici si retornavano ad Salerno per mare,  
 foro assaltate da una grandissima tempestate et fortuna de mare, unde  
 per la dicta tempestate si annegaro excepto uno che ne campò lo quale  
 manifestao questa cosa et dice che annegaro inter Capri et la Minerva.

29 (30B)

15

*Hearing of the difficult mountain route between Naples and Pozzuoli, Virgil  
 ordered a tunnel to be dug through it, ingeniously made and protected from  
 all criminal activity. Seneca mentions it in one of his letters, and the grosso  
 popolo claim that Virgil built it in one day.*

Avendo quisto poeta anche avertencia ale fatiche et tedii deli cittadini de 20  
 Napoli che gire voleano spisso ad Piczolo et ali bagnye soprascripte de  
 Baya li quali andavano per li arbusti de uno durissimo monte lo quale  
 era principio de affanno a.cquilli che passare voleano lo predicto monte

---

2 soctili] artificio e *add.* *P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 3 et ... medici] de medici o loro  
 consiglio *V* 4 caritate] carità *ti N1, veritate P2* || essereno pagati] *om. E* || desiderata]  
 caritate *add. GC* 5-6 el quale ... infirmi] in di li quali bagni *PL, E* 6 captivi medici]  
 capitani *P1, N1, SN2, P3, medici F, captivi et iniqui medici GC* 7 caritate] sanitate *N1* ||  
 grande ... iniquitate] grande iniquità c'aviano *PL, E, iniquitate GC* 7-8 da Salerno] *om.*  
*E* 8 deguastaro] devastaro *GC* || tucte] *repet. V* 8-9 parte ... ymagine] penture pente  
 e scripture indeli dicti bagni *PL, E* 9 da rompere] et opere *N1* 10 Per ... cosa] *om. PL, E* ||  
 la iusta] *om. GC* || la iusta ... condegnya] et con digna *V* 11 como ... retornavano] li  
 dicti medici ritornando *SN2, P3* || retornavano] trovarono *P2*, ne tornavano *SN1* 12  
 assaltate] assaliti *F, P2* 12-13 tempestate ... dicta] *om. GC* || unde ... annegaro] che  
 furono dala dicta tempesta annegati *PL, E* 13 per ... tempestate] tucti *F, N1, P2, SN1,*  
*SN2, P3* || che ne campò] *om. SN1*, chinde scampò *GC* 14 dice che] proprio *PL, E*,  
 chinde scampò et che se *GC* 15 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 20 poeta] eximio *add. E* ||  
 anche] ancora *PL, E* 21 gire] andare *V* || voleano] gire *add. N1* 22 li quali] li *P1,*  
*sci F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || li ... andavano] *om. PL, E* || arbusti] arbori *E* || durissimo] et  
 acerbissimo *add. GC* 22-23 lo quale era ... monte] *om. P2* 23 era] è *F, SN2, P3*

A tanto alo gire quanto alo advenire indereto et considerando per soctili geometria co una recta misura ordinò che lo predicto monte con multa operatione humana socto terra cavato et perforato fosse et fece fare una cava o viro grocta de longecze de passi mille la quale grocta fo con tanta soctelitate ordinata co uno spiraculo in meczo ala dicta grocta che per lo nassimento de lo sole luce da la parte de levante da la maytina per fine ad meczodi, et da la parte de ponente da lo meczodi per fine ala posta de lo sole.

Et inpercio che quilli che passavano la predicta grocta laquale era obscura et tenebrosa et per questo paria male segura, in tale disposizione de planete et cursi de stelle fo la dicta grocta cavata et de tale gracia dotata che per nisuno tempo may de guerra o de pace no.nde fo facto acto dessionesto ne per omicidio ne per robaria ne sforzamento de femine per fine ad nostri tempi.

De la quale grocta parla Seneca ad Lucillo nela tercza epistola dove dice, Quando yo devesse petere Napoli me piglyò una grocta de Napoli chya-mata Alphe, niuna cosa è pyu longa de quillo carcere, niuna cosa è de quille bocche pyu obscura.

B tanto da capo quanto da piede fe apere nanti che cominciassse la grocta. Et considerando per geometria chon una misura per podere cavare socto di questo monte ordinao che perforato e cavato il monte predicto fe fare una cava o vero grocta di longhecza e di larghecza la quale grocta fo chon tanto subtilidade ordinata che la mita dila dicta grocta per lo nasciemento dil sole lucie da la parte di levante da la matina per fin a mezo di, e dal mezo di per fi ala posta dil sole l'altra mita da la parte di ponente.

Et impero ch'a quegli che passavano illuogho era tinebrosa et obscuro che per questo paria mal sighuro, in tale disposizione di pianeti e cursi di stelle fo la dicta grocta cavata e di tal gracia dotata che niuno timore ni sospizione è a quegli ch vi passavano e che non vi se può ordinare imboschamento ni ivi se può fare acto dissonesto a dompne, e questo è provato e viduto per fi a nostri tempi.

Di la qual grocta parla Seneca a Lucillo ala epistola terza, e dicie, Quando yo dovesse peter Napoli me pigliò una grocta di Napoli chiamata Alphe. Niuna chuosa è di quelle bocche più obscuro.

A 1 quanto] como *SN1* || advenire] oviro allo ritornare *add. V* 3 geometria] gromatica *P1* || ordinò] ordine *P1* 6 fosse] suso *N1, F, P2, SN2, P3* 7 viro] uno *P1* 9 co] et *V* 11-14 luce ... sole] *om. N1* 12 maytina] maritima *GC* 16 era] o *P1, è F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 18 planete (*V*)] chyanete *P1, M1, F, SN1* 19 cursi] chussi *N1* 20 dotata] danata? *SN1* 21 may] ne *F* 22 facto] nullo *add. F* 24 per fine] ne per si fini *GC* 27 ad Lucillo] allo Cillo *GC* 28 yo ... petere] deve patere *GC* 29 me ... Napoli] *om. V, P2* || piglyò] piglaria *N1, SN2, P3* 30 Alphe] ad se *V* 30-32 pyu longa ... bocche] *om. P2, e add. P1* 31 niuna] in una *GC* 31-32 è de ... bocche] de quilli voce che *GC*

B 2 nanti] *om. E* 13 sole] luce *add. E* 21 passavano] passano *E* 23 fare] nullo *add. E* 29 pigliò] cioè *add. E* 30 è] più longa de quella carcere, niuna cosa è *add. E*

- A Et la predicta grocta et lo grosso populo tene che Virgilio facta l'avesse in uno di. Questo non è possebele se no ala divina potencia la quale de nichil cuncta creavit.
- E seque cierto se quel luogho avesse lucie la polve s'inde la levarey in di aperto dila grocta è una chuosa grava e molesta che là donde la polve se muove e trovase inchiuso senza alcuno spiraculo è neciessario che donde se muove là in quel luogho ritorne.

## 30 (31B)

*Virgil placed a hen's egg in a secret place within the Castello Marino, which is now called the Castello dell'Ovo after this egg. The ancient Neapolitans maintained that the castle would last as long as the egg remained whole.*

Era nelo tempo de lo dicto Virgilio uno castello hedificato dentro mare sopra in uno scoglyo propinquo ala cita de Napoli lo quale ogi appare et è chyamato lo Castello Marino o vero de Mare. Indela opera delo quale castello Virgilio, dollectandose con soy arte, consacrò uno ovo lo primo che fece una gallina. Lo quale ovo possi dentro in una carrafa per lo pyu stricto forame de la dicta carrafa, la quale carrafa ponere fece dentro una gabia de ferro soctilemente laborata.

- A Et la predicta gabia in una piccola camerecta socto lo predicto castello collocare fece. La quale camera secreta et ben rehyusa con grande sollicitudine et diligencia guardata fo.
- Et la dicta gagia la qual continia la carrafa e l'uovo fe ligare o appendere o chiavare chon alcune lamine di ferro di socto uno trave di quercia che stava appoggiada per traverso ale mura d'una camorella facta studiosamente per questa accagione chon due fossice per le quali intrava il lume.

A 1 et] che SN1, P2, de GC 3 non] era ne add. V || possebele] impossibile P3 4 se no] excepto SN1 || la quale] om. P1, quia F, la V

B 1 seque] siate E 2 levarey] levei E 3 è] et E 6 spiraculo] spectaculo E

8 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 12 hedificato] hedifica V 13 propinquo ... appare] como per fi mo è PL, E || ogi] in di vi add. V, SN1 13-14 et è chyamato] il quale se chiamava PL, et qual se chiama E 16 ovo] om. P3 || pyu] suo F 17 de ... carrafa] om. F, P2 || la quale carrafa] et V, et ovo add. PL, E || ponere fece] lo posse P1, F, N1, SN2, P3, puse P2 18-19 de ferro ... gabia] om. N1 18 soctilemente] subtilissimamente PL, in tale modo V

A 19 la ... gabia] om. V || gabia] carrafa SN2, P3 || in] dentro ad P1, N1, dentro F, P2, SN2, P3 20 camerecta] cabbiecta GC, cammera SN2, P3 || socto] sopra P2 21 collocare] alegare N1, allocare F, P2, SN2, P3 || secreta] secreta N1 22 rehyusa] inclusa V

B 21 chiavare chon] cavare via E 25 fossice] suffice E



A Et da quillo ovo lo predicto castello piglyao lo nomo inpercio che alo presente chyamato è Castello dell'Ovo che prima chyamato era Castello de Mare como è dicto de sopra.

Et li antichi napolitani teneano chyaramente che da lo predicto ovo pendeyano li facti et la fortuna de lo predicto castello et che durare devea tanto quanto lo ovo se conservava sana et salvo et cossi bene guardato.

B E chon grande diligentia e sollepnita la fe guardare in di la dicta camorella in luogho sigreto e sighuro di buone porte e chiavature di ferro, impero che da quello ovo da lu quale lu castello pigliò il nomo, pendevano tucti i facti dil castello. 5

Gli antiqui nostri tennero che da Alixandro in de le soe opere facte di Virgilio chiaramente adiscero che dall'uovo pendevano i facti et la fortuna dil Castello Marino. Viro è che lu castello dovia durare tanto quanto l'uovo se conservava chosi guardato. 10

## 31 (32B)

15

*As a youth, Virgil had entered an enchanted grotto in Monte Barbaro with a companion named Philomeno. Wishing to understand the miracles of the grotto and the deeds of Chironte, he took from beneath Chironte's head a book that made him very learned in necromancy.*

Donde non è da maraviglyare se lo dicto Virgilio habe tante sciencie et tante virtute, inpercio che nelo tempo de la sua iuventute secundo se lege ad anticha cronica intrò la grocta incantata de Monte Barbaro cavata ad infinito profundo co uno suo compagno chyamato Philomeno volendo avere chyara noticia de li miraculi de la dicta grocta o profunda cava et de quelle cose che ellà operate avea Chironte. Et toltoli de socto la testa 20 25

A 1 ovo] *om. F, SN2, P3* 2 inpercio] in presente *V* 9 da ... ovo] *om. V* || ovo] *om. F, SN2, P3* 10 et la] alla *GC* 12 conservava] consumava *V*, conserva *N1, F, P2, GC* 13 cossi] fo *add. V* || guardato] et anco deceano che lo primo che dicto ovo rompesse subito morea *add. SN1*

B 12 Viro (*E*)] Dio *PL*

15 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 20 Donde] honde *N1, om. F, P2, GC* || non] *om. PL* || habe] de *V* 21 se (*P1*)] fece *M1, F, N1* 22 la grocta ... de] ala cita che sta dentro *PL*, alla sita che sta a *E* 22-23 ad ... profundo] di socto una *PL, E*, andò *add. V* 23 compagno (*P2*)] compago *M1*, discipolo *PL, E* 24 grocta ... cava] cita *PL*, sita *E* 24-25 et de quelle ... operate] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 24-199.1 et de quelle cose ... che] *om. P1* 25 ellà] è *add. GC, om. V, E* || operate] opato *V* || Chironte] philosopho e là trovao la sepoltura di lo dicto Chironte *add. PL*, philosopho onde recita athala per fine alla fine ove trovò la sepoltura del dicto Chironte *add. V*, philosopho donde recercao tale grocta per fine al fine dove trovò la sopoltura delo dicto Chironte *add. SN1* || et toltoli] *om. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3*, et levògli *PL, E* || socto la testa] sopra il capo *SN1*

uno libro che se fece doctissimo et ammagistrato in de la nigromancia si tornò inderetro de la dicta grocta o vero cava.

## 32 (33B)

*In the time of King Roger of Sicily, an English physician sought Virgil's bones for their magic power. The Neapolitans let him have the books of necromancy found beneath Virgil's head, but refused to give him the bones, fearing harm would come to the city. For safety they moved the bones to the Castello dell'Ovo. The books performed many miracles.*

Morto finalmente lo dicto Virgilio in de la cita de Brindisi secundo che è dicto de sopra che potuto avesse intervenire de le soy ossa non è cosa da tacerese et lassarese sub silencio. In nelo tempo de Rogiere re de Cicilia delo quale innanci farrimo mencione sequendo nostra materia, fo uno fisico ingrese inclito de lo predicto re lu quale impetrate lictere da lo dicto re mandati ala universita de Napoli che liberamente dare devessero alo dicto medico fisico le ossa de Virgilio le quale ossa illo donate avea co omne altra cosa che dentro la sua sepultura vi fosse. Ale quale lictere et comandamenti la predicta universita in parte hobedire non volse, temendo non forsi per lo rimuovere delle dicte ossa da la cita predicta incorresseno alcuna mortalita o alcuno altro dampno. Et in parti hobedienti foro inpercio che la universita de Napoli conciosia

1 che] lo quale lo dicto Virgilio lo tolce et con quillo *N1, SN2, P3*, lo dicto Virgilio lo tolce et con quisto *F, P2*, in de lo quale libro *V, PL, SN1*, per lo quale *E* || in ... nigromancia] *om. V*, et avuto quisto libro *add. F, P2*, et poi *add. N1, SN2, P3* 1-2 si tornò ... cava] et in dell'altre sciense *PL, E* 2 vero] *om. SN1* 3 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 9 Morto] Porto *P1, GC*, [ ]orto *SN1* || Morto ... Virgilio] Advenne che lo dicto Virgilio morì *F, P2* || Brindisi (*P1*)] Brinsi *M1*, in dill'anno di gl'imperio di Optaviano Augusto XXV *add. PL, E* 10 de sopra] *om. PL, E*, e dicto *add. P2* || potuto] posto *V* || avesse intervenire] havere *N1* 10-11 non è cosa (*N1*)] nove cose non è *P1, M1, F, V, P2, SN1, GC*, nove cose non so *SN2, P3* 11 da tacerese] data cocessi *GC* 12 innanci ... materia] farremo mencione sequendo inansi *PL, E* || sequendo] in *P2* 13 fo ... lu quale] standola e fandovi soa dimoransa uno phisico inglese *PL, E* || fisico] philosopho *V* || inclito] intimo *SN1* || impetrate (*N1*)] inpetate *M1*, impetrao *PL*, improe *E*, se inpetrò *F*, se inpetèò *P2* 15 fisico] *om. V, N1* 16 che] là *add. V* || sua] *om. SN2* || sepultura] era et *add. V* 17 in parte] *om. F, N1, P2, P3, SN2* 18 temendo] che che *add. V* || non forsi] *om. N1*, non volsi *GC*, non fosse *SN1*, che *SN2, P3* || rimuovere] rimore *E* 19 incorresseno] la dicta cita incorresse *PL, E*, non ne incorresseno in *F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 20 hobedienti foro] hobediò *PL*, obedite *E*, hobediaro et foro hobedienti *V* || de Napoli] o citade *PL, E* 20-200.1 conciosa cosa (*V*)] consentiò *PL*, concessa de cosa *P1, M1*, concessia cosa *N1*, conciosa cosa *SN1*

cosa che lo dicto fisico una co.lloro alo sepulcro de Virgilio andaro, dove  
 trovaro alcune libri de nigromancia et de arte magica liquali stavano in  
 un vassello de rame chyuso et posto socto lo capo de Virgilio liquali libri  
 lo dicto fisico se.nde portò et le ossa lassò che dare nolle volsero li napolitani. Et accio che le dicte ossa forate non fossero dala dicta sepultura de  
 5 nocte da lo dicto fisico, che con grande voluntate delle avere cercatele  
 avea, o da altre persune, forono congregate et ricolti in uno sacco de coyro  
 per la universita de Napoli et riposti forono alo Castello dell'Ovo. Le quale  
 ossa in quillo tempo como una grande reliquie se mostravano per una  
 grata de ferro a.cconca le avesse volute vedere. De poy demandato lo  
 10 dicto fisico che cosa volea et intendeva fare delle dicte ossa, unde illo  
 desse che intendeva fare una coniuracione et demandare le dicte ossa  
 de Virgilio con coniuracione li decivano et manifestavano tucte l'arte de  
 Virgilio selle avesse potute avere per quaranta dì. Ma da poy che la cita  
 de Napoli convertita fo ala fede de xpo, le dicte ossa foro destrectamente  
 15 fabricate ad uno muro de lo dicto castello dentro ad uno scrignyo. Deli  
 quali libri de Virgilio testifica sancto Gervasio pontifice dicendo che nelo  
 tempo de papa Alesio vidi Johanne cardinale de Napoli fare per quilli libri  
 alcune experimenti et prove lequale so tucte trovate verissime. Et credese  
 et tenese che lo cardinale de Spagnya in de la nocte de la nativitate de xpo  
 20 celebrò tre messe in tre remoti parti de lo mundo che ipso si lo fece per  
 arte de nigromancia acquistata ad ipso per li libri de Virgilio liquali in  
 quillo tempo se guardavano dentro lo tisauro de lo papa de Roma.

---

1 fisico] medico *SN1* || alo sepulcro] alla sepultura *PL, E, V, GC* || de Virgilio] *om. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 1-2 andaro dove trovaro] andato e trovato *V*, trovaro *GC*, || dove trovaro] et consentero che prendesse *PL, E* 2 magica] d'indivinare per avere noticia *PL, E* 3 chyuso] conzo *E*, pruso *N1* || socto] sopra *P2, SN2, P3* || liquali] in quelli *E* 4-5 et le ossa ... napolitani] *om. PL, E* 6 che] non *add. P2* 6-7 che con ... avea] *om. PL, E* 6 grande] grata *V* || voluntate] desiderio *SN1* 7 o da ... ricolti] et forono recolte le dicte ossa *N1, SN2, P3* 8 riposti] preposte *GC* 9 quillo] succession di *PL, E* || como ... reliquie] *om. PL, E* || grande] *om. N1* || mostravano] mostrate *E* || una] grocta oviro *add. V* 10 le ... vedere] havesse volunta et voluto vedere *V*, vederelle voleano *N1*, le volesse vedere *SN1* || de poy] finalmente *PL, E* 11-12 fare ... intendeva] *om. PL, GC* 11 unde illo] *om. N1, P3, SN2* 11-12 unde ... intendeva] respose che voleva *E* 12 intendeva] indea *SN1* || coniuracione] de le ossa *SN1* || et demandare] di mandati *GC* 12-13 et demandare ... manifestavano] che como dimandava le dicte ossa sigli manifestavano *PL, E* 13-14 con ... Virgilio] *om. V* 14 selle avesse] avendole *F, P2* || dì] giorni *PL, E* 15 destrectamente] destremotate et *V* 17 de Virgilio] *om. V* || dicendo] *om. PL, E* 18 fare] *repet. GC* 19 alcune] *om. GC* || trovate] provate *P2* || verissime] tucte vere *GC* 21 celebrò] celebrasse *E* || in tre remoti] intremo *E* || mundo] cio è in Roma in Francza et in Spagna *add. SN1* 21-22 per arte] parte *E*, per parte *GC* 22 acquistata] ad questa *GC* || ad ipso] da christo *E, om. N1, P2, SN2, P3* 23 de lo papa] *om. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || Roma] li quali libri vennero in mane sue *add. SN1*

## 33 (34B)

*Before the coming of Christianity, the Neapolitans sacrificed to the pagan gods on a mountain now called Ara Petri. After Saint Peter came to Naples, a church was built in his honor on this spot, now also called San Pietro ad Ara.*

5

Qui si dimostra lo luoco dove primo sancto Pietro venendo da Antiochia et dessese in Napoli.

Le soprascripte cose forono tucte facte innanti la venuta de xpo et nanti che xpo se adorasse et honorasse in Napoli. In de lo quale tempo li citadini napolitani secundo la costumancza de li gintili o viro pagani facevano li sacrificii ali dey sopra uno monte appresso de Napoli loquale mo è chyamato Ara Petri che stay poco lontano ala cita.

10

- A Et in questo loco largo et piano aveano in uso de fareno li sacrificii nansi la venuta de Pietro apostolo et di poy ad honore et reverencia de lo glorioso apostolo predicto vi fo hedificata la sua ecclesia. Et quisto loco mo è chyamato Sancto Pietro ad Ara como innansi pyu declaramo.
- E puogho nansi la venuta di Pietro apostolo in Napoli era stato portato. Lu quale in quella pianura dove mo si chiama Ara Petri o Sancto Pietro ad Ara aviano in uso di fare i dicti sacrificii pigliò il nomo di Santo Pietro ad Ara. Avenga Dio c'alcuni s'il chiameno Ara Petri.

15

20

## 34 (35B)

*(Summary of Saint Peter's career.) Pausing in Naples on a sea voyage, Peter encountered an old woman named Candida, explained Christianity to her, cured and converted her. With a prayer provided by Peter, Candida cured her friend Aspren, whom Peter then baptized and instructed. Aspren converted many through his preaching and performed healing miracles; Peter consecrated him bishop of Naples.*

25

---

6-7 Qui ... Napoli] *tit. om. PL, P1, F, V, E, N1, P2, SN1*, Como napolitani nante la venuta di Pietro apostolo faceano li sacrifici sopra un monte lo quale mo è chyamato Ara Petri SN2, P3 8 cose] cossi *add. GC* || tucte] *om. E, GC* 9 et honorasse] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 9-10 In de ... napolitani] *om. V*

A 16 glorioso] gloriosissimo *F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 17 vi] dove *GC* 18 mo] como *SN2* 19 ad Ara] de Hara *V*, ad Hara *SN1* 20 pyu declaramo] declaramo et loco volse venir Petro per abacter la falce de quilli [*illeg.*] *SN1*

B 17 aviano] *om. E* || dicti] divini *E* 19 Dio] *om. E*

Como sancto Pietro convertiò sancta Candida et sancto Aspren ala fede xpiana et consacrollo viscopo de Napoli.

Lo quale sancto Pietro apostolo figlyolo de Johanne de la provincia de Galilea de lo vico de Bersayda da poy ch'èbe tenuta la catrida sacerdotale in dele parte de oriente per anni quactro, cantando messa 5 et dicendo solamente lo pater nostro, venne in Antiocia dove acquistò la catreda. Et fo capo de la ecclesia anni septe. Da poy venne ad Roma indela quale pervenne in de lo tempo de lo inperatore Cladio Nerone et qui medesimo tenne lo summo pontificio anni XXV et mise VII et iorni octo. Unde passando per la marina de Napoli et da longe vedendo la 10 cita la quale canosseva per fama dessese in dela dicta cita per riciacione de lo spirito desiderante la terra per che illo era fatigato per lo viaggio de lo mare multo longo. Et come se giva diportando se reposò in quillo luoco dove mo se chyama lo altaro de Pietro o vero Ara Petri. Et secundo la 15 disposicione de Dio vede passare una dompna vecchissima laquale sancto Pietro chyamò et incomenzò ad adimandarela se ella era cittadina de Napoli et como se chymava. La quale resposse cha ella era cittadina et chymavase Candida. La quale medesimo Pietro dimandò de la cita, de lo stato et de li cittadini, de lo habito, de la forma, delle custume, de la qualita de lo animo, et quale ragione, devocione, et lege erano in epsa, 20 deli sacrificii in oracione de Dio et quale religione, et se aveano una

1-2 Como ... Napoli] Como pervenne ad Napoli santo Pietro et li miraculli che gi fece *N1, SN2, P3, tit. om. PL, P1, F, V, E, P2, SN1* 3 Lo (P2)] alo *P1, M1, N1, V, [ ] SN1* || Johanne] Giovanna *PL, Iohanna F, Iohanna P2* || de la] *om. PL* 5 messa] *om. P2* 6 solamente] sollemnemente *V, om. P2* || pater nostro] unde *add. N1, P3, SN2, poy add. F, P2* || venne] unde *GC* 6-8 in Antiocia ... pervenne] *om. F, P2* 6 dove] là *F, P2*, unde *GC* 7 venne] andò *PL, E* 8 pervenne] pervenire *V* || de ... inperatore] *om. PL, E* 9 qui] *om. P1, N1, P2, P3, SN2*, là *PL, E* || qui medesimo] *om. F*, qui *P2* || summo] suo *V* || pontificio (*P1*)] pontifico *M1, F, N1*, pontificato *PL, E, V, P2, SN2, P3*, pontificale *SN1*, pontefice *GC* 10 iorni] ioanni *E*, di *F, P2* || Unde passando] e dopo passò *PL, E* 11 canosseva] per forma et *add. V* || dessese (*P1*)] disse *M1, om. N1* 12 spirito] tempo *GC*, sancto *add. N1* || desiderante] et desiderato *V* || fatigato] fatig *P1* 13 longo] tempo *add. F, P2* || Et come ... diportando] *om. SN1* || se giva] seguiva *V* || diportando] andando *PL, E*, reportando *N1*. 13-14 in ... luoco] *om. P2* 14 dove] unde *GC* || se chyama] è chiamato *P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || de] sancto *add. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 16 sancto] fa *E* || adimandarela] clamarela ad se *V* 17 la quale] *om. F, P2* 18 et ... Candida] *om. N1* || la ... medesimo] ala quale *SN1*, de che *F, P2* || dimandò] dimandando *P3, SN2* || de la cita] *om. F, P2* 19 et] *om. PL, F, E, V, SN1, P2, GC* 19-20 de lo habito ... in epsa] et deli loro costumi et in qual racione et devotione viveano li dicti cittadini et *F, P2* 19 forma] fama *V* 20 qualita] quale *GC* 20-21 epsa deli sacrificii] epsi saracini *V* 21 oracione] honoracion *PL* || et quale religione] et domandolla de multe et varie cose *F, P2* || religione] aviano in di la pieta *add. PL, E* || se] li cittadini *add. PL, E* 21-203.1 una medesimo] una sola *F, N1, P2, SN2, P3*, medesimamente una *E*

medesimo voluntate o viro diverse. Et se li populi avevano uno semele  
consentimento, et se ipsi se fidavano pyu ale forse o vero alo consiglyo,  
et finalmente se delle cose de li anticissuri et delli loro antichi fosseno  
rigide defensure sencza mutarese, o se d'alcuna nova scriptura, se ragiona  
evidente la conformasse, fosseno li citadini voluntarii per mollificazione  
de animo ad piglyarela. Et sopra tucte quille dimande fo facta ad Pietro  
per la dompna conveniente resposta.

Da poy la resposta per altre parole Pietro se transitò con tragrissione  
ale cose et parole de xpo declarando ala dompna che ipso fosse et donde  
venia, et chi lo mandava et como giva ad Roma, et che portava cose  
nove et non pyu vedute et non may pyu uditi et cose salutifere et beate,  
finalmente celestiale et divine, lequale cose in quillo tempo erano per  
ordene intervenute. Et como lo homo da lo principio dela sua nacione  
et criacione, negando la hobediencia alo suo criatore et per la volunta  
de lo libero arbitrio errao, et dipartiòse da la diricta et vera via, et como  
dall'uno errore all'altro et da male in pegio et da pegio in pessimo, avendo  
cicate li occhye interiuri de la mente, lo homo errao per fine a.cquillo  
tempo senza intermissione de uno momento. Et como a dovere absol-  
vere li laczi de quisto humano errore, Dio criatore de tucte le cose desti-  
nao et mandao da lo cielo la propria sua sapiencia ad prendere carne  
humana de una dompna vergene. Et per che et quale cose maraviglyose  
de opere et signale et finalmente de prodigii et miraculi questa vertu  
et sapiencia eterna se declarao. Laquale finalmente cola dicta sapiencia

1 populi] napolitani *E* || uno semele] seutele *E* 2 consentimento] considimenti *SN1*  
3-4 finalmente ... d'alcuna] se in epsa cita se rascionasse de alcuna *F*, se in ipsa cita  
se ragionasse de niuna *P2* 3 se] all'ultimo *add. PL, E* || anticissuri] antichissime *V* ||  
delli ... antichi] dell'antiquita *PL, E* 4 rigide] regali *V*, origidi et *N1*, origine et *SN2, P3* ||  
o] vero *add. SN2, P3* || scriptura] septa *PL*, scripta *E* 4-5 ragiona ... conformasse]  
*om. F, P2* 5 evidente] *om. P1, SN2, P3*, audente *E* || conformasse] conservasse *SN1*,  
confirmasse *SN2, P3* 5-6 per ... animo] *om. F, P2* 6 de animo] *om. P1, N1, SN2,*  
*P3* 7 per ... dompna] *om. E, N1, SN2, P3* || conveniente] communa *F, P2* 8 Da poy  
la resposta] *om. P1, N1, SN2, P3* || la resposta ... Pietro] per altre cose Pietro *F*, per altre  
cose *P2* || se transitò] fe transitio *PL, P1, F, E, V, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3* 8-9 con ... parole]  
rascionandoli *F, P2* 10 giva (*PL*)] gia *M1, P1*, andava *V, N1, SN2, P3*, venea *SN1* || ad  
o da *SN1* || Roma] et que portava di utilita ad ogni persona *add. PL, E* 11 pyu vedute]  
providute *PL, E* || et non may pyu] ne *F, P2, SN2, P3* || may] *om. N1* || uditi] vidute *GC* ||  
cose] cossi *GC* 12 finalmente] cose *add. F, N1, SN2, P3* || celestiale] celeste *SN2, P3*  
12-13 per ... intervenute] venute *F, P2* 13 lo homo] loco *SN1* 14 negando] ne  
gaude *V* || la] con *add. E* || per] *om. P2* 15 libero] vero *P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* ||  
et dipartiòse] departendose *E*, da partirse *SN2, P3* 17 interiuri] *om. E* || errao ... fine]  
era perso *E* 19 li] et *P1, GC* || Dio] che *V* 20 sapiencia] et *add. SN1* 21-22 Et per che  
... signale] *om. F, P2* 21 cose] *om. SN1* 22 de ... signale] de opponere et sagaciali *E* ||  
de] con *F, P2* 23 eterna] *om. F, P2* || se] dicta *V*

introducuto de li quali intorno overo a.llato de se, ordinò serveture con dignacione de grande benivolencia in una coniunctissima et familiarissima compagna de dudece, et ad se medesimo dede la principale signyoria, la quale finalmente co una larga magnificencia et mirabile largecze per gracia si se inclina ala invocacione et dimostrase possente factore de 5 fare signi et miraculi.

Ala quale parola quando vi venne Pietro, cio è che narrava la efficacia de fare li signi et miraculi, la vecchyarella Candida non sostenne che Pietro decesse pyu ma epsa rompe lo silencio et parlò et desse in questo mo: tenerrò per vero ciocche m'ay dicto innanti, crederò senza 10 dubio loro et sarramme restituuyta la sanitate ala pena de la mia testa? Allora Pietro non tardò niente ma desse, ne lo nomo de lo verbo paterno el quale ordinò l'altecze de li cieli, anpliò lo ayro, hornò la terra, produsse lo mare, fe la natura humana, laquale formò ad specie et ymagine de la sua similitudine, laquale amao con ardore de tanta benivolencia et quasi incomperabile deleccione et amore che epsa dignò congiungere ad se, facendose colley in una essencia de persona, indelo nomo deloquale yo comando ad te, infirmita pestifera et iniqua che molesti et affanni questa femina, intiso lo mio comandamento, fugi, dissolvi, cessa et torna ad niente, et cossi te parte che niuno minimo signyo de 20 te lassi né resti alo capo de questa femena, dando sempre honore et laude alo nomo de colluy loquale colo patre et colo vivente spirito sancto

1 introducto de] intro di dodici *PL, E* 2 in] con *P2* || coniunctissima] comitissima *SN1*, congruitissima *GC* 3 dudece] apostali *add. P2* || ad] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3*, de *V* || dede] de *V, GC* 4 largecze] *om. F, P2* 5 per] et *E* || dimostrase] dimostrarse *P3* || possente] *om. P2* 5-6 de fare ... et] *om. N1* 7-8 Ala quale ... miraculi] *om. V, E* 7-9 Ala quale ... parlò] de che la dicta donna Candida odendo parlare Pietro de li miraculi non sostenne piu ma rompe ad Pietro lo parlare *F, P2* 7 vi venne] veniendo *GC*, invende *SN2, P3* 8 sostenne] soferesse *E* 9 lo] parlare et con *add. E* 10 mo] modo non *V*, uno *PL, om. GC* || innanti] et *F, P2*, credero senza dubio cio che me ay dicto yo *add. V* 11 loro] loco *SN2*, si chiamando il nomo di colluy il quale tu lodi chon tante excellenti paruoie e siranno inclinati i mie dolori *PL* || loro et] *om. F*, loro se *E*, se *P2*, et *GC* || sarramme] serrance *GC* || de] ch'io sento a *F*, che ipso sancto a *P2* 13 el] allo *GC* || l'altecze] la torcia *N1* || lo ayro] bairo *N1* || hornò] criò *V*, ordinò *E* 14 lo] fructo hordinò *add. F, P2* || fe] et *GC* || formò (*P1*)] fermò *M1, V, PL*, serano? *GC* || ad specie] et dispartìo *N1* || specie et] *om. F, P2* 15 con] tanto *add. SN2, P3* || ardore de tanta] tanto fervore de *F, P2* 15-16 ardore ... benivolencia] benivolentia di tanto ardore *E* || de tanta ... deleccione] *om. P1* 16 incomperabile] incorporabile *N1, SN2, P3* 17 in una essencia] in una absencia *V, SN1* || de] et *N1, P3, om. E* 18 deloquale] deloquale *add. N1* || comando] cantando *SN1* || che] no *add. N1* 19 intiso] intendi *V* 20 cessa] *om. F, P2, E* 20-21 cossi ... resti] non lassare niuno signo de te *F, P2* 20 niuno] in uno *GC* || minimo] nimino *N1* || signyo] o radicie *add. PL, E* 21 lassi né] lassare *GC*, passi ni *PL* 22 patre] et colo patre *add. P1*

e quale è la vertu et quale è lo honore con core de gloria et una maiesta  
per tucti li seculi, amen.

Incontinente li xpiani de quillo luoco et quilli che venuti erano d'An-  
ciocia, sequendo le vestigie de Pietro tucte in compagnya, se allegrareno  
quando odero quillo miraculo et sollempne dicto de Pietro, et subito 5  
la sanita da la cielo, inpercio con volucissimo volato mandata, venne  
et intrò le secrete de lo capo de la dompna, et como ad signyorebele  
comandamento privao la dicta capo de omne infirmitate et langore. Et  
indelo dicto capo puosi quiete et riposo con dolcezza perfecta et perpetua  
iocunditate. 10

La non poteva essere celato ala dompna che da la sua testa era divolta et  
partita omne infirmitate et eravi reducta ad sanita. Et questo pensando,  
o como se maraviglyava como si subito et sencza tardamento reducta  
era in perfecta sanita in tanto in un poco de spacio de momento, epsa  
dubitava essere facta una altra dompna, ancora dubitavese essere ley 15  
medesma quale era prima. Inpercio che liberata non sentia asprezza de la  
passata incorabele infermita, non se credeckte la dompna si presto essere  
liberata ma per la vertu de Pietro et de soy parole fo liberata in si poco  
spacio de tempo et bagnata de una acqua salutifera. Et paravela che  
non obstante ch'ell'era per multi anni invecchyata, che fosse tornata una 20  
senplece cetella. Et como dananti era dinigrata ad modo de uno carbone

1 e] nel *N1, P3, SN2* 1-2 e quale è la vertu ... seculi] alo quale scia honore et gloria  
*F, P2*, dili seculi *add. PL, E* 1 con core de] con core et *N1, P3, SN2*, concorde *PL, E* ||  
maiesta] iesta *N1* 2 amen] et an *V* 3-8 Incontinente ... langore] Et subito la dicta  
Candida fo liberata de omne [omne: la dicta *P2*] infirmita *F, P2* 3 luoco] puogho *PL* ||  
venuti erano] venneronce *GC* 3-4 d'Anciocia] *illeg. GC* 5 quando] *om. GC* ||  
odero] et videro *add. V* || miraculo] miraculoso *PL, E* || sollempne] sollendo *SN1* ||  
de] *om. GC* || subito] subii *SN1* 6 inpercio (*P1*)] impiero *PL*, impetrò *E*, inperio *M1*,  
*N1, V, SN2, P3, illeg. SN1, GC* || volato] velato *P3* 7 et intrò] inter *V*, intro *E* 7-9 de  
la dompna ... dicto capo] *om. GC* 9 puosi] requie et *add. V* || et riposo] *om. F, P2* ||  
et perpetua] *om. V* 11 Ia] *om. GC* 11-12 Ia ... sanita] *om. F, P2* 11 essere] *repet. N1*  
12 eravi] erano *GC* || ad] in perfecta *E* 12-14 Et questo ... momento] maravegliandose  
la dicta donna Candida como sci prestamente era partita da la soa testa la mala infirmitate  
et reducta in sci bona sanita *F, P2* 13 o como] *om. PL, E*, omne uno *SN1* || tardamento]  
andimento *SN1* 14 poco] capo *P1* 15-18 essere facta ... liberata] et maginava  
non essere quella che era et parevali exere facta un'altra donna vedendose liberata de sci  
crucele infirmita per le parole de Pietro *F*, et maginava non essere facta un'altra dompna  
vedendo se liberata da si crudele infermita per la parole de Petro *P2* 15 essere] *om. GC* ||  
ley] la *SN2, P3* 16 liberata] era *add. V* || sentia] sencza *GC* 18 in si] inde *GC*, si *P1*  
19-20 et bagnata ... invecchyata] et parevali *F, P2*, pareva *add. N1, SN2, P3* 19 et  
paravela] *om. N1, SN2, P3* 20 invecchyata] inchinati *V* 21 senplece] et pura *add. F, P2*  
|| como] che *PL, E* || dananti] per la multitudine dell'anni et per la vecchiezza *add. F, P2* ||  
ad modo de] come *F, P2* || ad modo ... carbone] chomo a un crono *PL*, como un corvo  
*E*



et mo alo presente era debyancata como ad uno cinno, allegravase che dallo origine carnale e da essere figlyola de homo, era mutata per la gracia et ad operacione divina ad essere figlyola de Dio. Allegravasi che quasi essendo da niente et vile cosa per sua origine et mo per beata mutacione era divinuta perfecta et ad beatudine e cosa de Dio.

5

Et como è costumato lo homo avere compassione de li amici et dare ad ipsi maturo consiglyo se se puote, et avere habilitate de tempo de seccorrerele, dice la dompna sancta Candida ad Pietro che epsa ave per grandissimo amico suo uno lo quale era chymato Aspren, lu quale stimolato era de uno freno violente et forte d'aspera infermitate. Lu quale è homo benigno, pyu moderato che li altri in abstinencia, et si era indelo errore deli pagani, et se fosse religione ipso se poterrey chymare religioso, ornato de tucti ornamenti de virtute delle quale Pietro predicava excepto de la fede, dela quale se potesse sentire miraculo de la sanitate retornata in ipso, sencza dubio che la fede laquale Pietro predicava la piglyarray, et poterray anche essere ydonio defensore et dichyaratore de la dicta fede. Anche porray essere robosto et forte confirmatore in de la fede inpercio che illo è homo multo eloquente et quasi de la sua lengua sempre se spargeno fyume de bella eloquencia, la

10  
15

---

1 et mo] *om. F, P2* || ad uno cinno] fosse stata una fanciulla *F, P2*, che fosse stata de uno anno *N1, P3*, se fosse stata de uno anno *SN2*, un cisano *E 2* dallo] l' *V* || homo] si carnale *add. SN2, P3* || era] exere *F, P2* || mutata] divenuta *E 3* figlyola] *om. GC 3-5* Allegravasi ... cosa de Dio] *om. F, P2 4* mutacione] moratione *E 5* divinuta] divina *GC* || perfecta ... beatudine] a perfecta beatitudine *PL, E* || De Dio] perfecta *V 6* costumato] usanza a *SN2, P3* || costumato lo homo] costumanza sci l'omini come le femene *F, P2* || avere] lo homo *add. M1 7* maturo] bono *F, P2* || consiglyo] *om. GC* || se se puote] se potesse *N1, SN2, P3*, quando pote *F, P2 7-8* et avere ... seccorrerele] *om. F, P2 8* sancta] *om. F, P2, SN2, P3* || ad] sancto *add. SN1, SN2, P3* || ave] avea *F, P2 9* era chymato] è chiamato *PL, E, N1, SN2, P3*, se chiamava *F, P2 9-10* lu quale ... freno] *om. V* || stimolato ... d'aspera] longo tempo era che era stato molestato de una durissima *F*, gran tempo era che era stato molestato de una grandissima *P2 11* è] era *F, P2* || pyu] pro *E 11-12* si era ... se] sendegli errore dili pagani *PL, E 12* fosse] trovasse *F, P2* || fosse religione] fossero legioni *GC* || poterrey] averia potuto *F, P2 13* ornato] errato *V* || ornato ... de] tanto era hornato de tucte *F*, tanto era ordinato de tucte *P2 13-14* delle ... fede] et dele quale se potesse sentire et predicava Pietro eccetto de la fede *SN2*, et delle quale se potesse sentire et predicava Pietro de la fede eccetto *P3 14-16* excepto ... essere] et che se per soa virtu fosse deliberato de la soa infirmita che isso seria *F*, et che per sua virtu fosse liberato de la sua infermita che ipso serria *P2 14* dela] il *PL, E 15* sanitate ... ipso] sancta tornata in epso sanita *E 16* la] che la fede la quale *V* || piglyarray] pigliara *SN2, P3* || poterray] portera *SN2, P3* || anche] *om. V 17-18* anche porray ... fede] *om. F, P2, SN1 17* essere (*P1*)] *om. M1, GC 17-18* robosto ... confirmatore] forte conservator *V 19* sempre] quasi *N1, om. P3, SN2* || spargeno fyume] spargente forme *GC* || bella] *om. E 19-207.2* bella ... liberali] belli hornamenti et belli costumi *F, P2*

costume de la quale largissimamente se spargirra in doctrina et dissiplina dell'arte liberali.

Responde Pietro ad Candida et dice, figlyola, se quello lo quale tu parli è tuo amico et che te move ad compassione et desiderare che illo agia sanitate et prenda da me medicina, hobedisse alo comandamento che yo  
5 te faczo. Va subito ad quisto tuo amico infirmo et como tu sarray dove ipso sta infirmo, prindilo per la mano dericta et dille queste parole. Pietro dissipulo de xpo crucifisso in Iudeya in de la potencia de lo dicto nomo de Ihu xpo me manda che remota da te omne infirmitate et refermato in de  
10 la pristina sanitate; subito co omne velocita lassi lo lecto dove iace et viene alluy. Como Pietro habe dicto le sopradicte parole et intesele la dompna Candida, piglyò la via velocemente per finire lo comandamento facto alluy da Pietro et andò; et gionta là dove era lo infirmo parlò alluy tucto cio che uduto avea da Pietro. Et la dicta dompna Candida finita non avea  
15 anche la sua inbassata che subito la crodele infirmitate, conossendo che la sanita venia, comandò ali suoy serviture dulture et furie soy servitrici che posasseno molestare lo dicto Aspren.

Et finalmente como la sanita intrava per uno de li spiraculi de lo corpo de Aspren la infirmitate ussia per uno altro, et convertitase ad modo de ucello sempre fugendo como sbandita et scaczata. Per la quale  
20 cosa sì grande et mirabele miraculo Aspren subito levòssi da lo lecto.

---

1 se spargirra] *om. P1, N1, P3, SN2* || et (N1)] *om. M1, P1, P2, GC* 2 dell'arte (SN2)] dell'altri *M1, P1, N1, V, GC*, dell'arte de *SN1* 3 responde] responsa *P1*, ala quale respose *F, P2*, respose *E, SN2, P3* || ad Candida] *om. P1, F, P2, SN2, P3* || dice] disse *F, P2, SN2, P3* 3-4 tu parli] *om. P2* 4 è tuo (*P1*)] et tuo *M1* 5 me] te *V, om. GC* 6 amico] malado et *add. PL* || como tu] quando *E* 7 infirmo] *om. F, P2* 8-9 crucifisso ... xpo] *om. E* 9 me] et le *SN1* || remota] remove *N1* || omne] la *PL, E* || et refermato in de] et reducto a *P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3*, in *E* || refermato] serrai formata *GC* 10 iace] face *SN1* 11 sopradicte] sovrascripte *PL, F, E*, subscripte *N1* || et intesele] *om. F, P2* 12 velocemente] violentemente *GC* || finire] fornire *E, N1, SN2, P3*, hobedire *F, P2* 13 da Pietro] *om. N1, SN2, P3* || da ... andò] *om. F, P2* 13-14 et andò ... Pietro] *om. E* 13 gionta ... infirmo] *om. PL* || alluy] agli infirmo Aspren *PL* 13-14 tucto cio che] cio *GC* 14 uduto] et inteso *add. PL* 15 anche] inche *GC, om. F, P3* || conossendo] conosse *P1* 16 sanita] finita *GC* 16-18 comandò ... per uno] et intrando da l'una parte *F, P2* 16 furie soy] furiosi *P1, N1, P3, SN2*, furii sui et *V*, furie *PL, E* || soy servitrici] *om. GC* 17 posasseno] possano *E, GC* 18-19 et finalmente ... Aspren] *om. GC* 18 como] se *add. SN2, P3* 19-21 ussia ... miraculo] commenzava a uscire dall'altra parte et piacendo ala divina potentia per soa gratia lo dicto *F, P2* 19 altro] spiracolo *add. PL, E* || convertitase] convertevase *SN1*, convertiose *GC* 20 sbandita (*P1*)] spandita *M1* 20-21 sbandita ... mirabele] spandibile *E* || et scaczata ... miraculo] *om. SN1* 21 cosa] *om. N1* || sì] et cosi *SN2, P3* || miraculo] *om. PL*. || subito] *om. N1, SN2, P3* || levòssi] levatose *PL, E, SN2, P3*, li volse *GC* || da lo lecto] *om. PL, E*

Discordatose de vestirese suoy panni, non piglyò altro che sulo uno mantello, et non corandose de calzamenti correva como ad homo che avesse le ale. Correvano anbe duy in uno, ma Aspren, lu quale era stimolato de pyu fervente arduri per vedere colluy da quale era guarito el quale no avea may pyu veduto et era stimolato et compuncto omne 5  
 hora pyu per conossere il factore de sua sanitate, correva pyu forte et ammonia et constregeva li pie di Candidi vecchya li quali non poteano cossi correre ne avere forsa commo ley in cossi correre. Et iuncto Aspren a Pietro, considerò la terra scalpitrata da Pietro, in epsa si gictò, et piglyando Pietro per li piede incomenzò fortemente ad basareli con 10  
 grande amore.

Et da poy Aspren zocche udiò da Pietro comprese, intese et credecke tucto, et fecese baptizare in breve tempo perfectissimamente informato de tucta la oracione, doctrina, religione xpiana. Et da poy Aspren cresceva in honestitate et bone costumme et sollicitamente da iorno in iorno, da 15  
 virtute in virtute, et sancto bono homo incomenzò ad essere predicatore et operatore de la fede xpiana et de la doctrina de lo maystro suo Pietro. Et incomenzò ad cavare lo venino delle interuire de lo antiquo tragone, et infiniti homine per la sua predicacione fece reducir e ala unità de la

1 discordatose] discordandose *F, E, P2, SN1* || vestirese suoy panni] vestire suo per panni *PL*, vestire soi perani *E* || che] se non *F, P2* || sulo uno] lo *SN1* 3 avesse] havute *add. F, P2*, have *GC* || correvano] dunque *add. PL, E* || correvano ... uno] per andare ad trovare Pietro, la donna Candida adpresso *F, P2* || anbe] tucti *N1, SN2, P3* 4 fervente] ferute *P1* 4-6 arduri ... sanitate] amore per ritrovare lo benefattore che li aveva facta rendere la sanita *F, P2* 4 da quale] *om. GC* || da quale ... guarito] lo quale haveva guarito *N1, SN2, P3* || guarito] generato *SN1* 5 avea] era *GC* || compuncto] compremuto *V* 6 hora] via *GC* || pyu] *om. V* || factore] fatto *P3, SN2* 6-8 pyu forte ... correre] tanto forte che la dicta donna veccharella Candida non lo potea sequitare *F, P2* 7 ammonia] ancomenza *V* || pie di ... poteano] soi piedi. Candida vecchia non potea *N1, SN2, P3* || vecchya] *om. GC* || quali] *om. P1* 8 ne avere ... correre] *om. V, N1*, e che non poteano avere forsa ultra la loro natura *PL*, non potendo havere forza oltra la loro natura *E* || in cossi correre] cossi corrente *GC* 8-9 et iuncto ... scalpitrata] intrata *GC* 9 a] dove era *F, P2* || considerò] la quantita di *add. PL, E* || scalpitrata] sculpisato *V*, sculpisata *N1*, calpestrata *SN2, P3* || scalpitrata da] che avea calpisata *F, P2* || in epsa] et là *F, P2* || in epsa ... gictò] *om. PL, E* 10 con] per *F, P2* 10-11 con ... amore] dicti pie *PL, E* 11 grande] *om. SN2, P3* 12 Et da ... comprese] Pietro commenzandoli ad parlare et ad monirlo et ammagistrarlo ala via de xpo el dicto Aspren *F, P2* || Aspren] che *add. GC* || udiò] udito *P1* 13 tucto] *om. SN1* 13-16 fecese ... homo] et informato de la religione et doctrina et oratione de cristo se fe baptizare et in breve tenpo fo perfecto et bono xpiano et hornato [hornato= honorato *P2*] in tucte sancte et bone costumi *F, P2* 14 oracione] generacione *E* 16 sancto ... homo] sancto *P1*, facto bono *N1, SN2, P3*, per questo *PL, E* 16-17 essere ... et de] predicare la fe d'yhu xpo et dare *F, P2* 17 et operatore] *pos. post* "xpiana" *SN1* || de ... xpiana] *om. PL, E* 18 et incomenzò ... tragone] *om. F, P2* || ad cavare] havere? *GC* || venino] di fuora *add. PL*, de furia *E* || antiquo] inico *PL*, inimico *E* 19 fece ... unità] alla vita *V*

sancta matre ecclesia et ala fede de xpo. Et per la invocacione de lo nomo de lo salvatore nostro Ihu xpo incomenzò ad fare miraculi ad dimostrare signyali, cio è restituire la veduta ali ciechi, le mano de li zunchi, fermare li piede et le gambe a li zoppi, sanare li infirme, fortificare li dibili. Per quisti et altri miraculi Aspren incomenzò habondevemente ad acquistare la gracia de la ecclesia de xpo, per la quale cosa Pietro se allegrava avere facto cossi bono discipulo. Et per la bona sua opera et bono fructo che facto avea alo populo si lo fece et consacròllo episcopo de la cita de Napoli co omne pontificale dignita. 5

35 (36B)

10

*Having converted Naples and appointed its first bishop, Peter left for Rome. Aspren became ever more learned and strong in faith and never stopped preaching. His pious behavior and miracles defy description.*

Como sancto Pietro tornaio ad Roma et lassò sancto Aspren viscopo ala cita de Napoli. 15

Acquistata Napoli ad xpo sempiterno et lassatone signyore et viscopo como è dicto de sopra Aspren, in deli anni de la nativitate de xpo XXXXVI sancto Pietro se'nde andò per la via de la cita de Roma acio che pocza in quillo paese con ragione et con maraviglyusi miraculi la gloria et la potencia de Ihu xpo dechiarare. Et lo dicto Aspren tanto in pyu forte et pyu maiore vigliava et adoperavese ale doctrine de Dio, 20

1 sancta matre] *om. PL, E* 1-2 et per ... xpo] *om. SN1* 1 de lo nomo] *om. P2* 2 lo] sancto *add. GC* || nostro] *om. N1* || nostro ... xpo] *om. PL, E* 2-3 ad dimostrare signyali] *om. F, P2* 2 dimostrare] meracoli et grandissimi *add. GC* 3 cio è] a *PL*, et ad *E* || ali] occhi et alli *add. GC* || ciechi] refermare *add. F, P2* 3-4 fermare ... gambe] li piedi *F, P2* || li piede ... zoppi] le mano ali piedi ali corpi *N1* 4 et le gambe ... infirme] et li zoppi sanare et *SN2, P3* || dibili] et a sanare chuose dirrocte *add. PL, E* 5 habondevemente] *om. F, P2* || ad acquistare] *om. PL*, gran fama et credito et *add. F, P2* 6-7 avere facto ... opera et] *om. PL* 7 bono] sano *V* || Et per ... opera et] per la qual reverentia *E* || bono] *om. F, P2* 7-8 che facto ... populo] al populo et impero *PL*, al populo rendeza et impercio *E* 8 fece et consacròllo] consacrò *F, P2* || cita] ecclesia *F, P2* 14-15 Como ... Napoli] *tit. om. PL, P1, F, E, P2, SN1* 14 sancto ... tornaio] Pietro apostolo sinde andò *N1, SN1, SN2, P3* 14-15 ala cita] *om. N1, GC, SN2, P3* 16 acquistata] avendo Pyetro acquistata *F, P2*, conquistata *E* || sempiterno (*P1*)] san Pietro *M1, V, SN1, GC, om. PL, E* 17 è] avemo *PL* || de sopra Aspren] *om. E* || sopra] santo *add. SN2, P3* 18 XXXXVI] anni *add. P2* || sancto] *om. PL, E* || per ... de] ne *F, P2* 19 che] *repet. M1, P1* || pocza] potere *F, P2* || con ragione] inconvincibile *add. PL*, incominabile *add. E*, congregacione *GC* || con ragione et] *om. F, P2* 20 Ihu] *om. SN2, P3* || dechiarare (*N1*)] declararra *M1, P1*, declaratore *V* 20-21 tanto ... maiore] tanto piu forte maravelgiosamente *F, P2* 21 in] *om. V, P3* || pyu] *om. E* || maiore] maiormente *V, N1, SN2, P3*, sodore *add. PL, E* || vigliava] pigliava *P1*, veglia havia *GC* || de Dio] *om. V*

pyu ferventemente intendeva ala predicacione, quanto pyu se recordava che per questo specialmente devenuto era alo officio catredale de lo piscopato. Et per fine ala sua infirmitate de la quale moriò la parola de Dio iammay non mancò predicare et per niuna fatiga chi illo avesse non dementicò sua predicacione. Et quanto bene se dimostrò lo dicto beato 5 sancto Aspren piscopo in tucto lo tempo de sua vita et de lo suo piscopato, et como ali occhye de tucti li citadini piacque la sua conversacione, non se potarria per licterale sermone declarare. Eciamdio se infinite lengue parlassero de li pisanti miraculi liquali per suoy meriti adoperao divinamente si.nde farrebene stanche liquali so chyare et manifesti nella 10 cita de Napoli.

## 36 (37B)

*A rich, pious, but childless couple in Naples prayed incessantly to Aspren and were given a son named John, just like Zachary and Elizabeth in the Bible. To thank Aspren, they built a residence with many rooms and a 15 delightful garden, and to honor Christ they built an adjoining church by the piazza Capuana which still exists and is called the Stefania.*

Qui se narra como fo hedificata la basilica de Stephania per li meriti de sancto Aspren.

Inter l'altre et varie cose che so in presencia de me compositore de 20 quisto libro solamente scrivere una cosa non m'è greve. In questa cita

---

1 ferventemente] fervente GC || intendeva] et sempre frequentava F, P2 || quanto pyu] et tanto piu per che F, P2 2-4 che ... avesse] may PL, om. E 2 specialmente] om. F, P2, spiritualmente E || catredale] et catedra PL 3 per] sequiò F, P2 || fine] fare V 3-4 de la quale ... et] che mai non manchò [manchè = finò P2] de predicare la parola de Dio et mai F, P2 3 quale] per finche add. N1, P3, finche add. SN2 4 predicare] om. PL, E 4-5 non dementicò] dimenticato P2 5 predicacione] oracione N1 || dimostrò] portò F, porta P2 5-6 beato sancto] sancto N1, SN2, P3, beato F, P2 6 piscopo] om. F, E, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || tucto] om. F, P2 || et de ... piscopato] om. F, P2 6-7 et de ... ali] om. V 8 potarria] porria F, porrei P2, potea N1 || licterale sermone] lettere dermone SN2, P3 9 de li pisanti] dill'opre sancte et PL, E || pisanti] pensceri V 10 si.nde ... stanche] om. F, P2 || farrebene] verrebene PL, vederebene E, forano GC 10-11 liquali ... Napoli] el chiaro di le manifesta in publico non bisogna dil provare PL, et le cose chiare et manifeste in publico non bisogna dello provare E 18-19 Qui ... Aspren] Como Dio concesse havere uno figlolo ad uno lo quale era devoto de santo Aspren per lle soi bone opere et gran prehere N1, Como ad uno lo quale era devoto ad santo Aspren per sue gran preghe Dio li concesse havere uno figliolo SN2, P3, tit. om. PL, P1, F, E, V, P2, SN1 20 l'altre] multe PL, E || so] epso E, fo V || compositore] conpenitor V 21 scrivere] scrivero P3 || non] om. N1, V, SN2, P3 || non ... greve] nome et greve SN1 || m'è greve] agreve E

de Napoli erano duy cio è marito et moglyere timentino Dio secundo  
 che indelo evangelio si lege. Erano ambenduy iusti nanti a Dio et con-  
 tinuamente de nanti alo conspecto de Dio in tucti li comandamenti et  
 iustificacione de Dio sencza lamentacione, li quali non avevano figlyoli  
 et erano gentili et habundante de multa famiglya et ricchicze. Et sempre 5  
 como a divoti de sancto Aspren demandavano meriti ad ipso con piatosa  
 devocione et sempre lo stimulavano de continua pregaria ad cio che per  
 li suoy meriti si fosse a.lloro concesso uno figlyolo o figlyo. Li quali per  
 longo tempo lo molestaro per loro desiderii in tanto che le loro lacrime  
 et pregherie per li meriti de lo beato Aspren forono exaudite de nanti alo 10  
 conspecto de Dio. Finalmente si è licito de assimiglyare l'uno de quisti  
 ad Zaccharia et l'altro ad Elisabeth, per cio che a.lloro nacque uno altro  
 Johanne, cio è como Zaccharia et Elisabeth fecero Johanni, cossi a.cquistò  
 marito et moglyere nacque uno figlyolo chyamato Johanne, loquale cres-  
 sendo era luce de diverse virtute et honeste costumme ornato. Li pre- 15  
 dicte marito et muglyere non discordandose de sancto Aspren et che avea  
 acquistato per epso [sì factò dono, et tanto benefitio quanto mandato li  
 era da celo per ipso,] piglyaro per rendereli grazie ad honore de lo dicto  
 viscopo sancto Aspren. Et fecero l'ostiere suo con sale, camare et iardino  
 dilictissimo, et ultra a.cquesto ad honore et gloria de Ihu xpo fecero hedi- 20

1 erano] *om. V* || cio è] *om. PL, E*, tra *P2* || timentino] temevano *E*, timetero *V*, timenti  
 ad *F, P2*, timectino *GC*, che timeano *SN2, P3* 2 si lege] *om. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* ||  
 erano] como *V* || ambenduy] tucti dui *F, P2* || iusti nanti] iustinati *SN2, P3* || nanti ...  
 et] andantino *PL*, andavano *E* 2-3 continuamente] in oracione *add. F, P2* 3 de nanti]  
*om. GC* 3-4 in tucti ... li quali] et *F, P2* 4 figlyoli] figlio ni figlia *PL, E*, figlie ne figliolo  
*V* 5 multa] *om. V* || famiglya et] *om. F, P2* || ricchicze] et teneano gran famelgia *add.*  
*F, P2* 6 como a] erano *V* || como ... divoti] *om. PL, E* || ad ipso] *om. PL, P1, F, N1,*  
*P2, E, SN2, P3* 7-9 sempre ... desiderii] continuamente lo pregavano che li dovesse  
 concedere gratia che avessero un filgiolo e longo tenpo stectero in questa preghera et  
 divotione *F, P2* 8 o figlyo] *om. P1, N1, SN2, P3*, o figlia *PL, E, V, SN1, GC* 9 lo ...  
 per] molistero i *PL*, mostrasseno il *E* || molestaro] monstraro *GC* 10 beato] sancto *add.*  
*PL, E, V, SN1* 10-11 Aspren ... è] *om. SN1*. si è] sia *GC* 11 Finalmente] *om. E*, ad  
 me *add. F, P2* 12 l'altro ad] *om. SN1* || a.lloro] allhora *P3, SN2* || nacque] nassion *E* ||  
 altro] *om. P3, SN2*, san *add. SN1* 13 cio è ... Johanni] *om. E* 13-14 Zaccharia ...  
 moglyere] ad Zaccharia cio è che li *F, P2* 13 et] un altro *add. SN1* || et Elisabeth ...  
 a.cquistò] *om. V* 15 diverse] tucte *F, P2* || ornato] *om. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 16 marito  
 et muglyere] consorti *E* || et] de quello *add. P3, SN2* 16-18 et che avea ... piglyaro]  
 vedendo che per soe preghere aveano acquistato lo dicto filgiolo *F, P2* 17 per epso] *om.*  
*N1, P3, SN2* 17-18 sì ... ipso (*V*)] *om. M1, P1, N1, GC, SN2, P3* 17 dono] fono *E* ||  
 tanto benefitio quanto] quanto beneficio *PL, E* 18 piglyaro] piglare *N1* || ad honore de]  
 et honore al *E, V* 18-19 ad honore ... et] et merito *F, P2* 19 sancto Aspren] *om. PL, E* ||  
 l'ostiere] le stantie *E*, lo sacro *GC* || suo] del beato Aspren *F, P2* 20 dilictissimo] multo  
 dilecto *F*, multo delectoso *P2* || fecero] *om. GC*

ficare la ecclesia in basilica coniuncta alo dict'ostiero con duy ale et multe cappelle posta sopra la piacza de Capuana co una corte laquale per fine alo di d'ogi si vede et è chyamata la basilica de Stephania.

## 37 (38B)

*Aspren died an old man in the year 79. The Christian faith had its beginnings in his time, and he fulfilled his duties in Naples like a good shepherd for twenty-three years.* 5

Como fo morto sancto Aspren in bona et sancta fine.

Moriò sancto Aspren vecchissimo et plino de iorni ala tercza nona de augusto in de lo anno de la nativitate de Ihu xpo LXXVIII, socto loquale la xpiana fede habe principio et compìo lo suo officio como ad bono pastore lo quale avea adoperato indela cita de Napoli anni XXIII. 10

## 38 (39B)

*The Cumaean Sibyl, who was among the first of Naples' people (Naples having been settled by the Cumaeans), prophesied the deeds of Christ.* 15

Le cose de ipso xpo figlyolo de la vergene Maria e salvatore nostro avea profiticzato primo sibilla de Cuma laquale fo de le prime de la gente nostra, de la quale fo primamente habitata la cita de Napoli como in dietro narrato avemo. Per niuno modo è da lassare che no se dica la sua proficia. 20

---

1 in] o PL, E, et V, in SN1, de GC || basilica] basilicata N1, basilea SN1 || ostiero] edificio E || duy ale et] om. E || multe] paricchie PL, E 2 cappelle] ample P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 3 di d'ogi] tempo di mo PL, E, ad ogi F, P2 || et è chyamata] et chiamase PL, F, P2, et E, rechiamata SN2, P3 || basilica] basilicata PL, N1, basilea SN1 4 cap. 36 (37B) et 37 (38B) uniti SN2, P3 8 Como ... fine] tit. om. PL, P1, F, V, N1, P2, E, SN1, SN2, P3 || in ... fine] ali anni de iesu xo 79 SN1 || fine] vita GC 9 Moriò (PL)] Morto P1, M1, V, E, N1, SN1, GC, SN2, P3, Advenne che moriò F, P2 || sancto] om. F, P2, E 9-10 tercza ... augusto] terzo di de augusto ad hora de nona V 10 de lo] domo del add. V || de la ... xpo] dil signiore PL, E || Ihu] om. P3, SN2 || LXXVIII] Lxxxviii GC 11 compìo] pigliò V 12 adoperato] multo bene add. F, P2 || Napoli] como adireto narrato havimo per niuno modo e da lassare che non se dica la sua profecia add. SN1 || XXIII] XXXIII PL, E, XXIII inanti la sua venuta de jhu xo SN1 13 cap. 37 (38B) et 38 (39B) uniti SN2, P3 16 ipso] ihu P1, F, N1, P2, E, GC, SN2, P3 || xpo] om. V || Maria] om. PL, E 16-17 avea profiticzato] prophetizò SN2, P3 || avea ... primo] fo profetizato prima da F, P2 17 de le prime] prima P1, F, V, N1, P2, SN2, P3 18 habitata] om. N1 18-19 como ... avemo] om. PL, E 19 per niuno modo] onde? GC || niuno modo] in fino mo V 19-20 la sua proficia] om. PL, E 19 sua] santissima GC

39 (40B)

*(Prophecy of the Cumaean Sibyl.)*

Qui se narra la profecia de sibilla cumana.

Timirrando adunche ipso et tucti li homine generati de terra per fine  
 ch'èl lion ponito gridarra. Il lion serra destructo da uno piczolo homo. Da 5  
 poy surgerra la superbia de li troyani nominati da Enea et distrugerra  
 la gloria de Grecia. Uno lione politissimo confunderra Asia. Da poy  
 duy liuni fortissime combacterranno in de lo campo de Thesaglya et  
 l'uno de ipsi con grande superbia et l'altro serra divorato. Uno thoro  
 co uno piccolo remore tucte le parte de lo mundo porra socto tributo, 10  
 inelo tempo de lo quale lo angyello celestiale venerra, in de la ultima  
 etate si humiliarra Dio. Tornerra homo lo figlyolo de Dio, la divinita se  
 iongerra cola humanita et iacerra nelo feno. Lu quale angyello serra  
 nato de una citella Dio et homo et seranno innansi deversi signyali:  
 una dompna vecchissima conceperra uno che nanti saperra queste cose; 15  
 maraviglyandose lo mundo de una stella laquale dimostrarra la via verso  
 de levante. Quisto averra XXXIII piede et sey deta, sceglyerrasse in  
 numero de duduci pasturi, vencerra zascuno dimonio non co spata o  
 forcza de cortello ma collo modo pescatore, sommecterra la cita facta  
 de troyani, cio è Roma, et tucti li ri in vilita et povertate sopererra le 20  
 recchicze submecterra la superbia, et quando serra ucciso tornerra vivo

---

3 Qui ... cumana] *Tit. om P1, F, V, P2, SN1* || Qui ... narra] *De SN1, om. PL, E, N1, SN2, P3* || de] la prima *add. SN1* || cumana] de Cume *N1, SN2, P3* 4 timirrando] numerando *E, N1, remirando GC, SN2, P3, [ ]emera uno F, P2* || ipso et tucti] inpectituti *V* 5 ponito (*PL*)] ponto *M1, P1, E, N1, SN1*, penito *V*, ponte *SN2, P3* || ponito ... lion] *om. GC* || ponito ... serra] *om. P2* || gridarra] gridare *V*, gridava *P3* 7 Grecia] gratia *P1* || lione] pyone *P1* || politissimo] pulitissimo *F, N1, SN2, P3* || poy] *om. GC* 9 serra] *om. N1* || divorato] da *add. V* || thoro] pacifico *add. PL*, coro *P2* 10 co] da cio? *V* || parte] parole *P1* || mundo] p mundu *N1* 11 tempo] *om. P1, P2, N1, SN2, P3* || angyello] angelo *GC* || celestiale] de Dio *add. P3* 11-12 in de ... humiliarra] *om. N1* 12 etate] era *E* || si] che *GC* || tornerra] tenera *P1, P2, N1, SN2, P3* || divinita] divina *SN1* 13 feno] senno *E* || angyello] angelo *GC* 14 nato] nodrito *PL, E* || innansi] *om. V*, nati *SN1* 15 una] *repet. V* || dompna] *om. GC* || conceperra] *om. P3* || che] *om. V* 16 dimostrarra] demostra *P1* 17 Quisto] Ad quisto *GC* || XXXIII] XXIII *P1, SN1*, trenta dui *P2* || piede] anni *V* || et sey deta] sendeti *SN1* || sceglyerrasse] se elegera *P2*, sconglieassi *corr. ad congregarra GC*, scolgerasse *P3, SN2* 18 duduci (*P1*)] duci *M1*, dieci *E* 18-19 vencerra ... pescatore] *om. GC* 19 collo modo] col.lamo d'un *PL, E*, col.lomo de uno *V*, con lo ambro de uno *SN1* || sommecterra] sanctamente *GC* 20 de (*P1*)] a *M1*, doi *add. E* || Troyani] Troya *P2* 20-214.1 li ri ... in] le povertate se ponerranno in *GC* 20 povertate] polita *P3, SN2* 20-21 le recchicze ... superbia] *om. N1* 21 submecterra] et abactera *add. V* || ucciso] escito *N1* || tornerra] serra *P2*



et regnarra. Da poy viverranno quattro animali cole ale in testimonio de  
 quisto agnyello et sonarranno co una tromba. Ala quale contradirra una  
 bestia et la habominacione de lo spirito de lo tragone et serranno li piede  
 de la bestia sey cento sexanta sey per fine che viverra la abominacione.  
 Et lo lione principale signyure se converterra in agnyello et lo gallo che  
 stera cole bestie pecore se vesterra la piczola vesta. In quisto tempo la  
 gloria de li romani serra portato in uno loco lu quale se chyama Bisancio  
 et serranno li greci.

## 40 (41B)

*In 312 Pope Silvester baptized the emperor Constantine and cured him of  
 leprosy. Constantine in return built the Lateran palace, the church of the  
 Savior, now called Saint John Lateran, and the church of Saints Peter and  
 Paul. (List of territories in the Donation of Constantine, including all Sicily  
 except Naples, which he reserved for the imperial household.) Because of  
 this Donation, a voice from heaven was heard which said, "today poison  
 has entered the Church of God."*

Como lo inperatore Costantino dotò la ecclesia de Roma.

Poy la passione de lo nostro signyore Ihu xpo in de li anni de la sanc-  
 tissima sua nativita CCC XII essendo signyore de la universale ecclesia  
 Silvestro papa primo de nazione romana el XXXII poy de Pietro apo-  
 stolo lo quale guarìo lo imperatore Costantino plino de grande et acerbo  
 dolore de lepra meritò essere mandato da lo dicto sancto Silvestro per  
 sacro baptismo per la quale cosa lo predicto inperatore fece hedificare

1 et regnarra. Da poy] *om.* P2 || Da poy] *om.* P1, N1, GC, SN2, P3 || viverranno] virano  
 E, venerando/veneranno V, SN1, GC, SN2, P3 2 tromba] et serviranno la giosticia  
 e la lege senza riprensione *add.* PL || contradirra] contrarea N1, cadirra SN1 3 la  
 habominacione] ha hanominacione SN1 || serranno] esciranno GC 4 sey ... sey]  
 VLXVI E, sei cento sexanta P2 || viverra] venera V, vincera SN2, P3 5 signyure] *om.*  
 E 6 stera] uscira P2 || pecore] potere SN1 7 portato (V)] pontata M1, P1, F, N1, P2,  
 SN2, P3 || se chyama] serra chiamato V, se chiamava GC 8 serranno] esciranno GC ||  
 Greci] etc. *add.* PL 17 Como ... Roma] *tit. om.* PL, P1, F, P2, E, SN1 || dotò] de GC ||  
 dotò ... Roma] poi fo mandato de la lebra per lo sacro bactismo fece edificare lo palazo  
 Lataranensis per stantia de lo papa N1, *item et add.* con la ecclesia de lo Salvatore SN2, P3  
 18 lo nostro ... Ihu] *om.* PL, E || signyore] et salvator *add.* V || anni] *om.* V 18-19 de  
 la ... nativita] *om.* PL, E 19 sua nativita] sanctificacione anni V || CCC XII] ccc xxii  
 GC, SN2, P3, centesimo quatragesimo tercio PL, E || de la universale] universale della  
 V 20 primo ... el] *om.* PL, E || XXXII] piedi *add.* P1, xxxiii V, clxxxxii P2, xxv P3,  
 xxii SN2 20-21 apostolo ... imperatore] dopo PL, E 22 de lepra] debia GC ||  
 de lepra meritò] deliberato E || sancto] *om.* E 23 per] *om.* V || per ... inperatore] *om.*  
 PL, E

dentro la cita de Roma lo palaczo chyamato Lateranense per stancia de lo  
 papa cola ecclesia de lo Salvatore la quale ogi è chyamata Sancto Johanne  
 a.Llaterano. Laquale volse et iudicò devere essere la matre ecclesia de lo  
 mundo. La quale ecclesia lo predicto papa Silvestro sollempnimente la  
 consacrò che se chyama la hedificacione de lo Salvatore, [in dil tempo di  
 la qual consagracione la figura dil Salvatore] non per opera humana ma  
 per opera divina apparse designyata et penta in uno muro et per fine al di  
 d'ogi ille vi sta et appare. Anche fece fare lo predicto inperatore la ecclesia  
 de Sancto Pietro et de Sancto Paulo et donao ala sancta matre ecclesia  
 romana o viro alo dicto papa Silvestro la cita de Roma et tucta Canpagnya  
 et Radecofano per fine ad Cippirano et eciamdio li donò Ravenna et  
 Pontapoli et la Marcha de Ancona, lo ducato de Spoleto, le terre de la  
 contessa Melchiade, lo contato de Brectomino, l'isula de Corsica, l'isula  
 de Sardegnya, et tucto lo riame de Cicilia da.llà et da.cquà de faro excepto  
 la cita de Napoli sola, la quale reservò ad se per camera de lo imperio  
 ad cio che quando avesse voluto andare in ultramare et retornare ad  
 visitare la ecclesia de Roma, avesse una cita propria indelaquale se potesse  
 riposare et stare. Per la quale donacione facta ala ecclesia de Roma fo  
 udita una voce da cielo laquale desse, hodie diffusum est venenum in  
 ecclesia Dey, cio è ogi è intrato lo venino ala ecclesia de Dio.

---

1-2 la cita ... cola] il palagio suo Lateranense la *PL, E* 2 ogi ... chyamata] mo se  
 chiama *PL, E*, è ogie *V* 3 laquale] cose *add. P2* || ecclesia] de Roma *add. P1, N1*, de  
 Roma principale ecclesia *add. F, P2*, de Roma et *add. SN2, P3* 3-4 de lo mundo] e  
 di tucte l'altre ecclesie *add. PL, E*, et la prima de tucte le altre de lo mundo *add. SN1* ||  
 de lo mundo ... ecclesia] *om. V, GC*, la ecclesia *add. N1* 4 la quale ecclesia] *om. F, P2* ||  
 quale] *om. P1, N1, SN2, P3* 5 consacrò] sacrò *GC* || lo] sancto *add. GC* 5-6 in  
 dil ... Salvatore (*PL*)] *om. M1, P1, F, V, N1, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, P3* 5 tempo] temo  
*E* 6 per (*V*)] *om. M1, P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 7 opera] *om. V* 8 d'ogi] *om.*  
*P1, F, P2*, e tempo di mo *PL, E* || ille] ella *P1, F, P2, GC, om. PL, E, N1, SN1, SN2, P3* ||  
 vi sta] è vista *P1, F, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3* || fece fare] fiche *GC* || lo ... inperatore] *om. PL, E*  
 9 donao (*V*)] dona *M1, P1, N1, GC* || sancta] *om. PL, E* || matre] *om. GC* 11 et] tucta  
 la *PL, E*, et da *SN1* || fine] *om. V* || Cippirano] apparano *P3* || eciamdio] eciam *PL, E*, et  
 dipli *V* || donò (*N1*)] dona *M1, P1, GC* 12 Pontapoli] poi Napoli *SN2, P3* 12-13 de  
 la contessa] de la duchesse del *V*, concessa *GC* 13 Melchiade] Maltiedi *PL, Matelda E* ||  
 contato] stato *SN1* || Brectomino] Britonorio *PL*, Bruttonorio *E*, Brictonara *V*, Berthoncino  
*N1*, Brutonito *SN1* || l'isula de] *om. PL, E* || l'isula de Corsica] *om. SN2, P3* 13-14 l'isula  
 de] *om. PL, E* 14 riame de] tucta la *add. V* || de faro] *om. F, P2, GC* || faro (*SN1*)] fore  
*M1*, foro *P1*, ferro *V*, fora *N1, SN2, P3* 15 ad se] *om. PL, E* 16 quando] ipsi *P1* ||  
 avesse voluto] voleva *PL, E* 16-17 ad visitare] *om. V* || ad visitare ... Roma] a Roma  
*PL, E* 18 quale] cosa et per la quale *add. V* 19 udita] venuta *GC* || da cielo] angelica  
*PL, E* || hodie] *om. V* 19-20 hodie ... cio è] *om. PL, E* 19 diffusum] effusum *GC*  
 20 de] <sup>1</sup> Signore *add. E*

## 41 (42B)

*Constantine, on his way to Greece with Silvester, paused for several months in Naples, endowed its cathedral with many lands and created its officers. He also founded six Greek-rite churches in Naples whose priests participate in the cathedral's Holy Week liturgy. These were the richest churches in Naples because Constantine founded them, and he created churches with identical titles in Constantinople.* 5

Como lo inperatore Gostantino augmentò la matre ecclesia de Napoli de roba et honoraula de officii.

In successione de poco tempo poy volendo lo dicto Costantino inperatore andare per mare in Grecia, venne in Napoli una colo predicto papa Silvestro ove fecero dimoranza per pyu di et mise, et fine che apparichyati forono le nave per poterenò passare. Per laquale cosa lo predicto inperatore omne demane quasi vedeva la messa ala matre ecclesia de Napoli, et quanto pyu spisso audiva la messa là, tanto pyu tornava divoto. Et inpercio dotao et arricchyò la dicta ecclesia de Napoli de multe possessione et terre, et adornaò assay lo stato de la dicta ecclesia et multo la augmentò fandovi ordinare per sancto Zonio li canonici, cio è septe previti prebendati et septe dyaconi prebendati, ali quali lo inperatore donò terre et possessione. 10 15 20

Anche fece ordinare ala dicta ecclesia lo ciminarcha o viro dignita ciminarchato secundo le costume de la ecclesia primitiva et de lo arcevescopati de Grecia. [Inpercio che in omne ecclesia metropolitana overo archiepiscopati de Grecia] è il ciminarcha inperò che no ando le altre dignita, cio è preposto, cantore, archidiacono et li altri simili officiali. 25

---

8-9 Como ... officii] *Tit. om. PL, P1, F, P2, E, SN1* || augmentò ... officii] insieme co lo papa Silvestro ne vennero ad Napoli *N1*, et papa Silvestro vennero a Napole *SN2, P3*  
 10 In ... poy] Socciedendo il tempo *PL, E* || Costantino] *om. PL, E* 11 andare] *om. SN1* || papa] san *add. PL* 12 fecero] fece fare *SN1* || per] di poy *V* || per ... di et] parecchii *PL, E* 13 le nave] i navilii *PL, E* || Per laquale cosa] *om. F, P2* 13-15 Per laquale ... Napoli] *om. PL, E* 14 demane] di *V, SN1*, matina *P2* || quasi] *om. F, P2* || vedeva] odiva *V, SN1* 15 quanto] como *PL, E* || spisso] *om. F, P2* || là] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3*, ala matre ecclesia di Napoli *PL, E* || pyu] spisso *add. P1* 16 inpercio] *om. PL, E, F, P2* 17 terre] de Napoli *add. V* || assay] *om. V*, multo *F, P2* 18 septe] dyaconi *add. M1* 18-19 septe previti ... dyaconi prebendati] li diaconi et vii<sup>c</sup> preyte prebendati *V* 19 et ... prebendati] *om. E* 21-22 o viro ... ciminarchato] *om. V* 21 dignita] digna *N1* 22 ciminarchato] cimonarcale *E* 22-23 arcevescopati (*V*)] archiepiscopo *P1, M1, F, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3* 23 Grecia] ecclesia *N1* 23-24 Inpercio ... Grecia (*SN1*)] *om. M1, P1, F, V, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3* 24 è] et *N1, SN2, P3* || è il ciminarcha] *om. F, P2* || no ... altre] hanno libre *V* 25 officiali] officii *E*

Et tanto è a dire in greco cimmonarcha quanto in latino precipe de le cennere et deli sacrificii, la quale cosa dimostra lo effecto de questa dignita. Inpercio che lo cimonarcha fa et exercita indela ecclesia lo officio maiore, el nome bene se convene alo suo officio. In nisuna ecclesia de Ytalia ne eciamdio per tucto lo mundo da levante a lo ponente non è niuna ecclesia che agia tale dignita de ciminarchato excepto la ecclesia de Napoli et quella de Milana. Et lo iorno de sabato sancto sey primicili de sey ecclesie greche hedificate in dela dicta cita de Napoli per lo predicto Costantino inperatore songo tenute de venire ala matre ecclesia de Napoli et cantare et legere sey leccione greche zascuno la sua. Et lo dì de Pasca Resurreccione songo tenute ad assistere alo dicto cimminarcha ad cantare a la ecclesia lo Credo in vulgare secundo la lengua greca et secundo lo rito de li greci. Il dicto cimminarcha fare deve alcune acti liquali se chyamano in latino vulgare Squarcase.

- A Le sopradicte sey ecclesie foro hedificate et dotate per lo predicto inperatore et inter l'altre ecclesie napolitane queste foro le pyu ricche et non è da maravigliare in percio che dotate foro da lo predicto inperatore. Et le ecclesie songo queste, cio è: la ecclesia de Sancto Georgio de Mercato, la ecclesia de Sancto Ianario ad Iaconia, la ecclesia de Sancto Iohanni et Paulo, la ecclesia de Sancto Andrea ad Nido, la ecclesia de Sancta Maria Rotunda, et la ecclesia de Sancta Maria ad Cosmandi. Et ad zascuno sia noto che
- Le predicte sey ecclesie sono queste, cio è: la ecclesia di San Giorgio di Mercato, la ecclesia di San Ienaro a Iaconino, la ecclesia di San Giovanni a Paulo, la ecclesia di Sancto Andrea a Nido, la ecclesia di Sancta Maria Ritonda, e la ecclesia di Sancta Maria a Cosmandi. Et impero non è da maravigliare se inter l'altre ecclesie di Napoli queste so ricche per che fuorono dotate dagl'imperadore predicto. Et sia manifesto a ogni persona che simili ecclesie di queste a questi proprii titoli si sono ala cita

1 in greco] *om.* N1, SN2 || in latino] *om.* PL, E 2 cennere] *cumeri* E 4 maiore] et impero *add.* PL || maiore ... officio] *om.* V || in] et SN2, P3 5 da levante a] *om.* PL, E || è] *om.* N1 6 ciminarchato] *cimonarcha* PL, E, V 7 primicili] principali V, primi cirii P2 8 de Napoli] et dotate PL, E 9 songo] venute et *add.* SN2, P3 10 leccione] sermoni E || zascuno la sua] *om.* PL, E || dì] giorno PL, E 11 Resurreccione] de surrepcione SN1 || assistere] consistere P2 11-12 alo ... cantare] *om.* N1 13 rito] dicto P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || il ... cimminarcha] *om.* V || il dicto ... deve] diveno fare in de la dicta ecclesia PL, E || alcune] certi P2 14 Squarcase] Squarca: se P2

A 17-18 napolitane] foro hedificate che in Napoli V 21 cio è] *om.* V, SN2, P3 22 Georgio] Gorgorio P1, Gregorio F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 23 Ianario] Ianuaria V, *om.* N1, SN2, P3 || Iaconia] alla Coma SN1 24 Iohanni et] et P1, *om.* F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 27 Maria] *om.* SN1

B 21 Ritonda] totonna E 25 fuorono] sono E

A simile ecclesie de queste et de quisti di Costantinopoli. La quale il predicto B  
simili proprie tituli songo ala cita de imperadore multo aumentò et magni-  
Costantinopoli hedificate per lo pre- ficò in ecclesie, chierici, et officio  
dicto imperatore. La quale cita pre- divino.  
dicta fo multo augumentata et magni- 5  
ficata per lo predicto inperatore in  
ecclesie, clerici et officii divini.

## 42 (43B)

*Constantine also built a chapel in the Stefania called San Giovanni delle  
Fonte, dedicated to St. John like the Lateran in Rome. During his stays in 10  
Naples he usually heard mass here.*

Fece eciamdio lo predicto inperatore indela ecclesia de Napoli in quillo  
luoco chyamato la basilica de Stephania una cappella de presso la tribuna  
de la dicta ecclesia del titulo de vocavole di Sancto Iohanni delle Fonte, et  
fare la fece socto quillo titulo che intitulao Sancto Johanne ad Latarano in 15  
Roma. In dela quale cappella lo predicto inperatore per fine che dimorò  
in dela cita de Napoli per grande devocione le pyu dele volte celebrare  
udiva la messa li.

## 43 (44-45B)

*The nearby cell where Aspren and Candida had lived was endowed with 20  
perpetual indulgences by Pope Silvester. This oratory is called Santa Maria  
del Principio because it contains an image of the Virgin and Child, perhaps  
the first ever painted in Italy. It stands within the church of Santa Restituta,  
founded by Constantine. Candida's body was later moved from here to  
the church of Sant'Andrea a Nido. Candida's many miracles include curing 25  
the quartan fever of anyone who drinks the water in which her bones are  
washed on her feast day.*

A 1 simile (P1)] se mille M1, F, N1, SN2, P3, mille P2 || de queste] om. SN1 || et de quisti]  
om. N1 2 proprie] om. SN1

8 Tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 12 Fece] et GC, om. SN2, P3 12-13 in quillo ... Stephania]  
che in del tempo antiquo se chiamava Santa Stephania PL, E 13 cappella] hedificare  
fece add. M1, P1, V, N1, SN1, GC, SN2, P3 13-14 la tribuna ... vocavole] om. E 14 del]  
dicto add. P1 14-16 et fare ... Roma] si chomo socto il dicto titulo la fe fare ala  
ecclesia de Sancto Giovanni a Laterano posta a Roma PL, E 15 che intitulao] de SN1 ||  
intitulao] intitulado P2 17 dela cita de] om. PL, E || per grande ... celebrare] per diverse  
volte PL, E || devocione] repet. N1 || le pyu ... volte] in piu de le la N1 || celebrare (V)]  
celebra M1, P1, celebrava GC 18 udiva] vidiva P1, F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3 || li] om. P1,  
PL, F, N1, P2, E, divina V 19 cap. 42 (43B) et 43 (44-45B) uniti SN2, P3

Como Gostantino inperatore fece hedificare Sancta Restituta et le indulgencie chence dede sancto Silvestro.

Era di presso la predicta cappella propinquo alo portico de lo palazo episcopale una piczola habitacione o vero cella co uno oratorio alo quale vi era uno altaro dove sancto Aspren per fin che visse con quella vecchyarella sancta Candida, che qua adietro parlato avimo, in castissima et sancta vita dusse. Lo quale oratorio per la divocione et oracione de quella sancta vecchyarella, la quale inter l'altre napolitane illustrata de lo amore et gracia de Dio meritò essere purificata per lo sancto baptisimo et essere sanctificata, lo populo per oracione frequentava et visitava multo quillo luoco. Indelo quale oratorio lo gloriosissimo papa sancto Silvestro una colo inperatore spisso venia, et per divocione li celebrava la messa. Alo quale oratorio lo dicto sancto Silvestro che per sua propria devocione et per la presencia sua in de la sua celebracione li citadine de Napoli vi frequentasseno et con pyu honore ne facessero memoria. Ancora ad cio che lo populo fedele alo dicto oratorio ad fare oracione pyu copiosa et devotamente venesse, de largecze apostolica multi spirituali meriti, doni, et perdonance vi concese et che vi devessero demorare in perpetuo. Quisto oratorio et quillo luoco sancto, cio è quillo altaro dentro la ecclesia de Sancta Restituta dov'è oggi alo presente se chyama Sancta Maria de lo Principio. La quale ecclesia de Sancta Restituta fece eciamdio hedificare lo inperatore predicto per divocione ch'èbe ala dicta beata vergene sancta

1-2 Como ... Silvestro] papa *add. V*, Como per lo dicto papa fo concesso ad questo oratorio de sancto Aspren infinite perdonanze *N1, tit. om. PL, P1, F, P2, E, SN1, SN2, P3* 3 Era] Là *E* || di presso] *om. V* || propinquo] di San Giovanni et dipresso *PL, E* || palazo (*N1*)] paczo *M1*, placzo *P1* 4 oratorio] cimiterio *V* 4-5 alo quale vi era] et *PL, E* 5 altaro] allo quale seu *add. P1* || dove] alo quale sedia *F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || sancto] sta *SN1* 6 adietro] di sovra *PL*, sopra *E* 6-7 in ... sancta] castissima *PL, E* 7 dusse] visse *V, SN2, P3, om. F, P2* || oratorio] cimiterio *V* || et] della *SN2, P3* || oracione] orone *GC* 8 la quale] *om. V* 9 et gracia] *om. PL, E* 10 frequentava] frequentativa *V* 10-11 multo ... luoco] *om. PL, E* 11 oratorio] santo oratorio *F*, cimiterio *V* || papa ... Silvestro] *om. V* 12 spisso] sespo *P2* || li] spisso *P1, N1, SN2, P3, om. F, P2, GC* || celebrava] celebrare ce faceva *F, P2* || la messa] *om. PL, E* 13 sancto] papa *PL, E* || che] sci *F, P2* || et] que *add. PL, E, SN1* 13-14 et per ... celebracione] *om. V* 14 presencia sua in] perseverantia *F, P2* 14-15 frequentasseno ... memoria] visitavano multo *F, P2* 15-18 Ancora ... concese] e ad cio confermarli et che con piu alegra devotone ce andassero vi concesse multe perdonanze *F, P2* 16 fedele] andassero *add. GC* || oratorio] andassero *add. V* || pyu] piosamente ovvero *add. E* 17 venesse] *om. V* || largecze] allegreze o devocione *N1, SN2, P3* || spirituali] spiraculi *SN1* || doni] et divini *SN2, P3* 18 vi] et *SN1* || vi] loco *SN1* || demorare] stare *PL, E, exere F, P2*, adorare *GC* || in perpetuo] perpetuamente *F, P2*, in *GC* 19 altaro] altro *P1, N1, SN2, P3* || dentro] *om. SN1* || ecclesia] cappella *PL, E* 20 oggi ... presente] mo *PL, E*, ogie *P2* 21 ecclesia] cappella *PL, E* 22 predicto] Constantino lu quale *add. PL*, el qual *add. E* || vergene] *om. V*

Restituta, laquale in quilli tempi sanctificata era, et donòlla alo capitulo de la ecclesia de Napoli et ricomandòlla alo suo regimento et maximamente alo cimminarcha, ali canonici, previti, dyaconi prebendati, li quali erano in numero de quactordici secundo che testificanno multi instrumenti et secundo che se lege ala legenda de sancto Actenaso. 5

Ma per che se chyama Sancta Maria de lo Principio? Dico che la ragione si è questa, che in quillo luoco fo in primo constructa et penta o vero scolpita la ymagine de la Vergene Maria colo figlyolo in bracza, et forsi questa fo innanti et la prima che in altra parte de tucta Ytalia depenta fosse. Et per queste duy raysune non è da maraviglyare si è grande devo- 10 cione et concorso de lo populo omne di; non è percio indebitamente si nce solevano habitare alcune dompne romite renchyuse in quillo proprio loco dove la beata sancta Candida indelo servizio de Dio di presso la dicta ecclesia propinqua alo palaczo de sancto Aspren viscopo finiò sua vita. De la quale sancta Candida lo suo corpo fo levato de quillo luoco uno 15 certo tempo po, fone sepellito in dela ecclesia de Sancto Andrea ad Nido et posto in uno sepulcro de marmora dove appare ogi ornato de certi versi colo suo epitafio.

[45B] La predicta sancta Candida fece multi miraculi et per suoy sanctissimi meriti fa omne di. Ma una cosa per utilitate de quilli che 20 no lo sanno non voglio tacere et mecterello in silencio, cio è se alcuno homo fosse infirmo de vicio de febre quartana et una volta beverra con

---

1 et donòlla] la dicta cappella donò PL, E || capitulo] capellano E || de] Napoli ovvero a add. V 2 Napoli] il quali era in quel medesimo tempo add. PL, E || et ricomandolla] recomandandola E, SN1 3 dyaconi] et add P1, F, N1, SN1, SN2, P3 4-5 et secundo] om. N1 5 ala legenda] om. V 6 Dico che] om. E, V 7 questa] om. PL, E || in primo] om. E || constructa] consecrata SN1 9 forsi] tenese che F, P2 || questa ... prima] inansi PL, E || fo] fosse F, P2 || et] che N1 || in altra] de nulla altra E, in niun'altra F, P2 || tucta] om. F, P2 9-10 depenta fosse] om. PL, E 10 si è] senza N1, P2 11 et] et add. GC || non è] om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3, non E, V || indebitamente] che debitamente N1, indelaramente SN1 || si] om. V, P2, SN1 12 nce] loco SN1 || solevano habitare] habitano PL, E, soleno habitare V, SN1 || romite] om. E, heremite SN1, remote SN2, P3 || renchyuse] che add. PL, E || quillo] populo add. SN1 13 dove] om. PL, E, ove è V, do P2 14 propinqua] e di presso PL, E || palaczo] passaggio SN1 15 Candida] om. SN1 15-16 uno ... po] in cierto spacio di tempo e PL, in spatio de certo tempo et E 16 po] om. V || ad Nido] om. PL, E 17-18 dove ... epitafio] e factovi lu epitaphio ornato di molti versi PL, E 17 ogi] la predicta sancta Candida add. V 19 la ... Candida] om. V || per] om. P2 19-20 per ... meriti] om. PL, E 20 fa] vi fece V, om. GC || fa ... de] fo manifesto ad F, P2 || omne] a P1, N1, SN2, P3 || di. Ma (V)] demane M1, P1, GC, demando N1, demando SN2, P3 21 non] om. GC || non ... cio è] om. F, P2 || voglio (V)] vuo PL, vole M1, P1, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3 || è se] ipso GC 22 homo] om. F, P2 || de] alcuno add. P2 || quartana] quarantana V || beverra] vevera P2, SN1, vivera GC

devocione dell'acqua cola quale lavato è stato lo corpo et le ossa de sancta Candida laquale acqua se da inello dì de la sua festivitàte, per la virtute de lo omnipotente Dio et meriti de sancta Candida subito se era sanato et perfectamente liberato.

La quale acqua si conserva per la virtu 5  
di Dio per un anno e piu, che pare una  
chuosa mirabele a direse, senza per-  
dere odore ni sapore e senza corrup-  
cione.

## 44 (46B)

10

*Eutyches and Acutius, martyred companions of Saint Januarius, appeared in a vision to assure a doubting woman of the efficacy of the indulgences granted to Santa Maria del Principio.*

El miraculo lo quale demostroa duy cavaliere martire ad una dompna napolitana devota de Dio.

15

Non è iusto anche lassare in silencio quillo miraculo lu quale advenne ad una dompna in deli anni de xpo C XXIII poy la morte de papa Silvestro. Laquale nobele dompna multo devota de Dio frequentava et visitava lo sopradicto oratorio in delo quale lo dicto papa Silvestro avea celebrato per multe fiata et vedea ad l'altra gente visitarelo como eciamdio ogi se fa. 20  
Sopravenne ala dicta dompna una grande affecione distintamente volere sapere le larghe indulgencie et perdonance concesse alo dicto oratorio

1 dell'acqua] coll'acqua P2 || lavato (N1)] levato M1, P1, GC, om. SN1 || è stato] è N1, fosse F, P2 || sancta] la beata sancta F, la beata P2 2-3 laquale acqua ... Candida] om. N1, SN2, P3 2 se da] fe E, se vole dare F, P2 || di] giorno PL, E || di ... sua] om. P1 || festivitàte] infermita P2 || per] de P1, che per V 3 de] la beata et add. F, P2 || sancta] om. E || subito] subitamente SN2 3-4 se era sanato et] serra sanato et V, SN1, GC, sera sano et N1, se sana et è PL, se sanano et E, è sanato et F, P2, si è risanato et SN2, P3 4 liberato] se libera E 7 a direse] om. E 14-15 El ... Dio] Como apparsero dui santi martiri ad una donna laquale donna era andata ad dire soi oraciuni N1, Como apparsero dui santi martiri ad una donna li quali sedeano & teneano uno schiaccchio innanti SN2, P3, tit. om. PL, P1, F, P2, E, SN1 14 demostroa] demonstraro a V 16 anche] ancora PL, E, om. V 17 dompna] de Napoli add. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || de xpo] cento venti quactro seu add. P1, om. PL, cio è add. GC || papa] san E, P2 18 nobele] om. F, P2, nobilio multo GC || Dio] quando spisso add. PL, E 19 lo sopradicto] per lo dicto GC 20 ad l'altra] multa F, P2 || gente] generalmente E || visitarelo] visitando V || ogi] mo PL, E 21 distintamente] destinatamente P1, F, N1, P2, P3, SN2 22 larghe] larghezze et P1, F, N1, SN2, P3, loche V || et perdonance] om. P1, F, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3



per lo dicto sanctissimo papa Silvestro con quale tentacione de anima  
 inpercio che pyu convenebele li pareo de dovere frequentare et visitare lo  
 oratorio et lo altaro dove stavano li corpi sancti de li sancti martire cio è  
 de sancto Jenuario et sancto Uticeto et sancto Acucio cavaliere et cittadino  
 de Napoli li quali in quilli iorni vicino aveano prisso martirio per servare 5  
 la fede de xpo.

Laquale dompna per fine che dava et faceva devotissimo oracione a  
 Dio altissimo per avere questa noticia et sapere le predicte indulgencie,  
 uno maytino assay per tempo se levò, et secundo che avea in usanza,  
 se.nde andò ad visitare lo predicto oratorio dove trovone ley duy mar- 10  
 tiri Uticero et Acucio li quali sedeano in nanti alo altaro et teneano uno  
 tavoliere de schyacche innanti, et non iocavano ma cortesemente tocca-  
 vano le case de lo tavoliere et como aveano toccato per dericto voleano  
 toccare per traverso. La dicta dompna manifestamente canossendoli, et  
 per loro visiune tornata uno poco freda poy uno poco scaldada d'amore 15  
 de animo, sise li appressimao et desse, Dio ve salve sancti martire! Per  
 che siti venute ad quisto loco sancto ad numerare lo tavoliere dove pyu  
 ragionevelemente se deverria adorare? Maraviglyome che aviti piglyata  
 si vana et inutile fatiga; che dice lo proverbio de omne numero infinito,  
 quisto monta pyu che lo scacchero, quasi a dire che lo numero de lo 20  
 scacchiero è infinito. Ala quale dompna li sancti martiri feceno questa

1 sanctissimo] *om.* SN1 || papa] sancto *add.* GC || con ... anima] *om.* SN1 || quale] qualche PL, E, V, quale è GC 2 che] è *add.* V || pareo] parte GC || dovere] avere P1 || et visitare] *om.* GC 3 de li sancti] *om.* P2, de li SN1 3-4 cio ... sancto] *om.* PL, E 4 Uticeto] Fucione E, Vincetio P2 || sancto] *om.* E GC, SN2, P3 || Acucio] Acurio E, Acuar SN1 5 de Napoli] *om.* P1, de F, N1, P2, SN2, P3, per *add.* GC || quilli iorni] quel tempo E || servare] preservare SN1, severare GC 7-8 che ... altissimo] in tanto che stava in oratione a Dio F, P2 7 dava] diceva E, andava N1 || oracione] devocione N1, devotione et oratione SN2, P3 8 sapere] sopra P2 9 maytino] martiro N1 || assay] troppo P2 || se levò] *repet.* N1 9-10 secundo ... se.nde] *om.* V 10 trovone] erano V, trovano GC || ley] li P1, F, P2, SN2, P3, quey PL, E, V, SN1, *om.* N1, li predicti GC || duy] *om.* V 11 Uticero] Eutice PL, Entice E, Vincentio P2 || alo altaro] a l'altre E || teneano] in mano *add.* V 12 cortesemente] corsemente N1 13 le case de] *om.* E || como] advenne che *add.* V || toccato] contado PL 13-14 voleano toccare] toccavano F, P2 14 toccare] contare PL || manifestamente] apertamente P2 15 visiune] viso P2 || poco] *om.* GC 16 de animo] divino PL, E, V || appressimao] un poco *add.* V 17 sancto] *om.* N1, SN2, P3 || numerare (PL)] narrare M1, P1, F, V, N1, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, P3 18 deverria] dovrey PL, E || maraviglyome] maravigliosamente E, maravegliannone GC || piglyata] *om.* P2 19 inutile] in vile V, non utile GC || de] che de M1, P1, che GC || de ... numero] *om.* F, P2, SN2, P3 || numero infinito] chuosa forte et impossibile a numerare PL, E, numero et infinito GC 20 quisto monta] con stomorta GC 20-21 quasi ... scacchiero] *om.* N1 21 questa] *om.* GC

risposta. O dompna, no te maraviglyare si avemo piglyata fatica cha non è vana ma serra ad te utile se tu cridi alo numero de lo tavoliere essere grande et infinito. Et in percio saczi et teni per certo che le perdonanze donate et concese ad quisto oratorio da sancto Silvestro vicario de xpo in terra et sono grandissime et infinite. Li quali inpercio se nascondeno et non se publicanno et non se dicono chyaramente ad cio che lo populo de Napoli loquale è multo inclenebele ad peccare et propinquo ali peccati sub sperancza de la perdonanza et infinite indulgencie de quisto luoco fosse pyu disposto ad peccare. Et dicte queste parole subito li sancti martiri disparseno.

## 45 (47B)

*Silvester and Constantine left Naples for Greece where they held the Council of Nicaea and appointed Nicholas bishop of Myra. Silvester returned to Rome, died and was buried in a place called lo Capo, where a church in his honor was built called San Silvestro dello Capo.*

Como moriò sancto Silvestro papa da poy che tornò da Costantinopoli.

Poy non troppo grande tempo lo predicto sancto Silvestro colo imperatore Gostantino se.nde andò da Napoli in Grecia per mare dove dimoraro un certo tempo. Et facto consiglyo ala cita de Nicena de Bectinia in de loquale consiglyo lo beato Nicola fo facto viscopo de Mirra. Et da poy che illo habe disposta la fede cactholica et composti multi decretali da quillo luoco se.nde tornò ad Roma dove per anni XXIII et misi X indela signoria de la ecclesia de Dio fo morto et sepellito appresso alo palaczo de Octaviano in uno luoco lo quale è chyamato lo Capo. Et alo loco dove fo sepellito ad honore de Dio et de lo predicto sancto Silvestro ze fo hedi-

1 fatica] et affanno *add. GC* 1–2 cha non è] gia non *E* 2 vana] in vano *PL, E* || serra] utile *add. P3* || se tu] et *V* || cridi] cade *GC* 3 saczi et] *om. SN2, P3* 4 donate et] *om. V, date et P2, dove se GC* 5 infinite] grazie *add. SN1, infinitissimi GC* || nascondeno] canoscondono *GC* 6 et non se] ni.nse *PL* 6–8 ad cio ... la] et multo credebelemente peccariano se sperancza havessero di quello *V* 7 inclenebele] incredibile *SN1, GC* || propinquo] è prohibito *E, propinto N1* 8 luoco] *om. GC* 9 disposto] disonesto *E* 16 Como ... Costantinopoli] Como lo imperatore Costantino et papa Silvestro si partero da Napoli et andaronde in Grecia *N1, SN2, P3, tit. om. PL, P1, F, P2, E, SN1* 17 Poy ... tempo] non molto da poi *E* || troppo] *om. V, P2* 18 da] ad *F* 19 Nicena] Vicena *GC* 20 lo beato] *om. PL, E* || de] quey di *add. PL, E* || Mirra] Merea *V, Murrea GC* 21 composti] desposti *SN1* || decretali] decreti *PL, E* 22 X indela] X fo nela *N1, SN2, P3, xi nela SN1, xiii de la GC* 23 signoria de la] *om. F, P2* || fo morto et] et qui moriò et *N1, et qui moriò et fo SN2, P3* 24 lo quale è chyamato] dove se chiama *PL, E* 24–224.1 alo loco ... ogi] al tempo di mo si chiama *PL, E* 25 sepellito] sancto Silvestro fo *add. SN1*

ficata una ecclesia socto lo suo vocabole lu quale appellato è ogi Sancto Silvestro de lo Capo.

## 46 (48B)

*Silvester was much troubled by Jews through the actions of Helena, Constantine's mother, who was then a Jew. Silvester converted Helena and all her Jews and freed many Romans from the pestilence of the Dragon. He bound the Dragon and imprisoned it behind bronze doors until Judgment Day. He ordered that deacons wear the dalmatic and that mass be performed in white linen like that in which Christ was buried.*

Como sancto Silvestro habe multa infestacione da li iudey et como convertiò sancta Elena et liberolla dalo tragone.

Questo Silvestro poy la conversione de Costantino fo molto infistato da li iudey per operacione de sancta Elena matre de Costantino laquale in quillo tempo era iudea. Per la quale infestacione sancto Silvestro habe multa molestia et multe bactaglye de animo et multe contriccione con iudey. Poy como pyacque ala divina potencia laquale dede forza et virtute ad sancto Silvestro che con suoy miraculi la predicta sancta Elena con tucti suoy iudey ad xpo se convertiò et bapcizata da sancto Silvestro et liberata una grande parte de lo populo de Roma da la pestilencia de lo tragone lu quale avea uccise sey milia homine colo suo fiato. Lu quale tragone sancto Silvestro ligato che.ll'ebbe si lo renchyuse socto le

1 socto] et subito V || socto ... vocabole] *om. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || quale] ecclesia *add. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || appellato è ogi] fo chiamata *N1, SN2, P3*, è chiamata *P2* 2 de lo Capo] de lo quale monasterio de dopne monache è conservata la capo de lo glorioso sancto Joanni bactista *SN1* 10–11 Como ... tragone] *tit. om. P1, PL, F, V, P2, E, SN1* 10 habe ... como] *om. N1* 10–11 habe ... tragone] convertiò et fece baptizare Elena matre de Constantino et liberò la citta di Roma dalo dragone lo quale multi ne havea uccisi *SN2, P3* 11 sancta Elena] et fe bapcizare Elena matre de Costantino *N1* || liberolla] liberò la cita de Roma de la pestilencia *N1* 12 Silvestro] *om. E* || conversione] conversatione *F, N1, E, GC* || infistato] festato *E* 13 li] dui *E* 14 iudea] pagana *V* 14–15 Per ... molestia] in de le quali infestacione fo molto costante et fermo a la fe di xpo, e dopo la grande molestacione *PL, E* 15 et multe contriccione] *om. PL, E* || contriccione] contreccaone *P1*, contempione *V*, contradictioni *P2* || con] da *SN1* 16–17 Poy como ... miraculi] *om. PL, E* 16 forza] aiuto *add. P3, SN2* 17 ad ... Silvestro] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || sancta] *om. PL, E* 18 xpo (*P1*)] ipso *M1* || convertiò] convertero *V, GC* || et bapcizata ... Silvestro] *om. SN1* 19 et liberata ... populo de] liberoe *E* || liberata] *om. PL, liberao GC* || una] con *add. P2* || una ... de] *om. SN2, P3* || Roma] po che sancto Silvestro liberao Roma *add. PL* 20–21 lu quale avea ... tragone] *om. GC* 21 ligato] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3*, ligatolo *E* || che.ll'ebbe] *om. PL, E, N1, SN2, P3* || renchyuse] inchiuso *PL, E*, ripiuse *N1*

porte de rame et si lo fermao là per fine alo di de lo iudicio. Questo sancto Silvestro papa si ordinò che li dyaconi de avangelio se vestessero le diamatiche et anco ordinò che lo sacrificio de lo altaro se facesse in panno de lino bianco secundo fo involuto lo corpo de lo nostro signyore Ihu xpo quando sepellito fo, et non in panno de seta ne panno 5  
tinto.

## 47 (49B)

*Constantine and his daughter Constance, caught in a sea storm between Constantinople and Rome, prayed for deliverance to their preferred saints, John the Baptist and Lucy. Landing in Naples, they founded a church 10  
dedicated to both. Constantine endowed it so richly that at that time it surpassed the cathedral in wealth.*

Como Costantino inperatore cola sua figlyola Costanza hedificaro la ecclesia de Sancto Iohanne et de Sancta Lucia in Napoli.

Di poy uno grande tempo alo tempo de papa Liberio tornando Co- 15  
stantino ad Roma con Costanza sua figlya et con Patricia sua nepote ad visitare et fare reverencia et assistere a la sancta matre ecclesia de Roma et maximamente per la sisima che succesa era in Roma per here-  
ticia de papa sostenne grande tempestate alo mare de Cicilia sopra lo 20  
capo de Trapani et avendone grande tempesta et fortuna de mare sic-  
che dubitavano de annegaresi et essere divorati dale unde delo mare.

---

1 rame] roma *N1*, *GC* || là] *om. P1, PL, F, V, P2, E, SN1, GC, SN2, P3* 2 papa] *om. PL, E* ||  
de avangelio] et evangelii *V, om. P2* || vestessero] vestero *P1* 3 diamatiche] humatiche  
*V* || che lo] collo *P1* 4 involuto] imolato et imoluto *V*, in velluto de *GC*, involato *P3*  
5 Ihu xpo] che Ihu *P1* || ne panno] ne *PL*, e non *E* 13–14 Como ... Napoli] Como  
lo imperatore Costantino volendo tornare da Grecia ad Roma sustenne una fortuna in  
mare *N1*, Como lo imperatore Constantino sostenne una gran fortuna de mare dove  
fece voto si scampava edificare una ecclesia al vocabulo de san Gio. Baptista *SN2, P3*,  
*tit. om. PL, P1, F, P2, E, SN1* 13 cola] et la *V* 13–14 la ecclesia ... de] *om. GC*  
15 Di] ma de *SN2, P3* || uno] non multo *PL, E*, no *SN1* || uno ... tempo] *om. F, P2* ||  
Liberio] Liberto *V*, Tiberio *GC* 16 ad] da *E, GC* || con] *om. E* 17 visitare et] *om. PL*,  
*E* 18–19 che succesa ... papa] de li Donatiste *PL, om. E* 18 succesa era] soccese *SN1*,  
stata *add. SN2, P3* 18–19 per hereticia de] lo *GC* || hereticia de papa] heretici de papa  
Silvestro *V* 20 avendone] havendono *P1*, per la *F, P2* 20–21 avendone ... dubitavano]  
chomo dubitava *PL, E* || avendone ... divorati] dubitando de essere devorate et annegati  
per le gran fortuna et tempesta de mare *N1*, dubitando d'essere devorati et annegati per la  
gran fortuna *SN2, P3* 20 grande] *om. GC* 20–226.1 de mare ... percio] et dubbitando  
de non annegare *F, P2* 21–226.1 dale unde ... percio] lo dicto *SN2, P3* 21–226.4 dale  
unde ... tempesta de mare] *om. N1*

Unde percio Costantino vocatose a Dio et ad sancto Johanni Baptista, lu quale per lo ricepere de lo sacro baptisimo poy de Dio ad ipso sancto Johanne stava ferma, che si liberava da quella fortuna et tempesta de mare che non peresseno che como iungeva in Napoli faceva hedificare una ecclesia alo vocabole de sancto Iohanne Baptista in dela 5 quale promese spendere trenta milia ducati. Et audendo cio madamma Costanza sua figlyola si ne fece un altro simile ad quisto voltandose ad sancta Lucia laquale in quilli medesimo iorni sanctificata era, ala quale sancta la dicta dompna avea grande devocione, che se de quella tenpestate liberati erano salvi, delle soy proprie rendita adiungea a la 10 dicta ecclesia de Sancto Johanne ducati vintimilia ad honore et reverencia de Sancta Lucia. Ali quali vuti lo piatuso Dio consentiò, et si li liberò da lo dicto periculo sani et salvi. Pervennero in Napoli et stati alcune di vennero ricordati de li loro vuti et possente per volenterusi de reducerelli ad effecto. Et avendo pensamento et concordia infra de. lloro, 15 lo dicto Costantino una cola figliola comandaro et fecero hedificare la ecclesia laquale ogi è chyamata Sancto Johanne Maiure et Sancta Lucia socto loro vocabole et titulo costructa. Indela tribuna de la quale ecclesia si è depenta la ymagine de lo Salvatore minazante et terrebele si

1 unde percio Costantino] *om. PL, E* || percio] ondo *add. V* || vocatose] vutato *PL, votaro E, votatose P1, votòse V, votandose F, P2, voltandose SN1, votative GC, facendo voto SN2, P3* 2 lu quale] *om. V* || per] po *PL, E* || lo ricepere de] *om. SN2, P3* || sacro] santo *E, V, sacro santo GC* || poy de Dio] *om. E, piace et add. V* 2-3 ad ipso ... Johanne] ogni soa divocione *PL, E* 3 che] che *add. GC* || liberava] campava *F, P2* 3-4 et tempesta de mare] *om. PL, E* 4 de mare ... che] *om. F, P2* || peresseno] paresseno *P1, perisse PL, E, peressimo GC* || che] *om. P1, N1, SN2, P3* || faceval] fare *N1, SN2, P3, faria E* 5 alo vocabole] ad nome *E* 6 promese (*P1*)] promessa *M1, promesse E, N1* || spendere] *om. P1* || audendo] avendo *P1, GC, cendo di V* 6-7 audendo ... voltandose] unaltro voto simile a questo si fe madama Gostansa soa figliola *PL, E, similmente madamma Costanza soa filgiola fece vuto F, P2, semelemente Madamma Costanza dubitando ancora non perire in mare [mare= cal N1] laqual Costanza era figlola de Costantino fece vuto N1, SN2, P3* 7 si ne] fine *P1* || altro] altare *SN1* || quisto] voto *add. GC* || voltandose] votendose *V, votandose GC* 8 laquale] in quello tempo et *add. V* || medesimo iorni] giorni *PL, E, tempi F, P2* 8-9 ala ... dompna] et in ley *F, P2* 9 sancta] Lucia *add. PL, E* || la dicta dompna] *om. N1, SN2, P3* || grande] *om. E* 9-10 che se ... salvi] promictendoli se fosse liberata da quella fortuna *F, P2* 9 se] escesse *GC* 10 tenpestate] fortuna *N1, SN2, P3* || liberati] *om. GC* || salvi] *om. SN1* || soy] persone delle *V* 11 dicta] hedificazione di la dicta *PL, E, propria F, P2* 11-12 ad honore ... Lucia] *om. PL, E* 12 lo] clemente et *add. V* || consentiò et] consentendo *PL, E* 13-14 stati ... di] dopo essi *PL, E* 14 di] iurni *F* || vennero] viene *PL, ben E* || vennero ricordati] recordandonosi *N1, SN2, P3* || possente per] *om. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3, possente et V, PL, E, possente et per GC* || volenterusi] voleronose *GC* 15-16 infra ... cola] lu dicto Gostantino intro di se et di soa *PL, E* 16 lo dicto ... figliola] *om. F, P2* 17 laquale ... chyamata] di *PL, E* || ogi] *om. N1* 18 costructa] *om. PL, E* 19-227.1 minazante ... sì como] co minzante et terribile viso santo mo *E*

como deve parere in de lo dì de lo iudicio, et como apparce alo populo de  
 Roma ala matre de tucte le ecclesie, cio è in Sancto Johanne a.Llaterano.  
 Et da.ll'uno de li lati de la ecclesia si è lo altaro et de sopra in alto vi sta la  
 ymagine de sancto Johanne et alo altro lato si è lo altaro et la ymagine  
 de sancta Lucia puro sopra, ad cio che sia manifesto ad ciascuno che 5  
 in de la dicta ecclesia cossi è lo titulo de sancta Lucia como de sancto  
 Johanne et cossi de sancto Johanni como de sancta Lucia. Et in de la  
 dicta ecclesia ze è tanta indulgencia quando è Sancta Lucia de lo mese  
 de decembro como quando è Sancto Johanne de lo mese de iugnyo et  
 nelo antiquo tempo cossi ze era concurso de gente per l'una festa como 10  
 per l'altra. In de la quale ecclesia alo servizio de Dio et de epsa ecclesia  
 forono ordinate l'urdene de canoniche regulari como sono fine alo dì de  
 ogi ad Sancto Pietre ad Ara liquali veniano inter lo inchoystro lo quale  
 stava depresso a la corte de la ecclesia secundo che eciamdio per fine alo  
 dì d'ogi si pare li insgnali de la habitacione et de li hedificii. Fo anche la 15  
 dicta ecclesia dotata riccamente da lo predicto inperatore intanto che, se  
 avesse tucte le possexione soy le quale in quillo tempo habe, passaria in  
 recchecze la maiore ecclesia de Napoli.

## 48 (50B)

*Constantine's niece Patricia, on the same ship, vowed to become a nun if 20  
 saved. She duly invited the nuns of SS. Nicandro e Marciano (now called  
 Santa Patrizia) to join her in a monastery on the Salvatore island. Return-  
 ing to Constantinople, she received from her grandmother Helena filings*

1 deve ... como] *om.* P2 || in ... dì] al giorno PL, E || apparce] appare GC 2 de  
 tucte le] ecclesia dell'altre SN2, P3 3-4 de li lati ... [Johanne] *om.* E 3 de la ...  
 vi sta] si è la ecclesia et all'altro lato si è lo altaro et GC || de sopra ... vi sta] *om.* PL ||  
 alto] lo altro SN1, altro P3 || vi sta] si ey N1, P2, si v'è SN2, P3 4 [Johanne et] *om.* V ||  
 et la ymagine] *om.* P1, F, N1, SN2, P3 5 puro ... cio] *om.* PL, sopra cio GC 5-6 puro  
 sopra ... Lucia] *om.* E 5 ciascuno] ogni persona PL 6 è (P1)] *om.* M1, GC 7 et  
 cossi ... Lucia] *om.* F, P2, SN1 || cossi] como *add.* V 8 ecclesia] chosi *add.* PL, E ||  
 ze] cio GC || quando] quanto GC 8-9 de lo mese de decembro] *om.* V, SN1 || lo mese  
 de] lo de P1, *om.* F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 9 decembro] settembre E || quando] *om.* GC ||  
 de lo mese de iugnyo] *om.* SN1 10 de gente] de popolo PL, E, *om.* P2 10-11 per  
 l'una ... l'altra] ala dicta ecclesia in del giorno di santa Lucia como nel di san Giovanni  
 PL, E 11 alo servizio ... ecclesia] *om.* V, E || et de ... ecclesia] *om.* F, P2 12 forono]  
 vi sono E || l'urdene] *om.* P2 || l'urdene ... canoniche] canoci V 13 ogi] mo PL, E, si  
 como sono *add.* V || ogi ad] *om.* N1 || Ara] Hora E 13-15 liquali ... hedificii] *om.*  
 F, P2 13 veniano] vivevano E, viveano SN1 14 stava] *om.* P1, è N1, P3, SN2 ||  
 fine] allo dì se pare *add.* GC 14-15 alo dì d'ogi] mo PL, E 15 fo] fece V, fi  
 GC 16 se] *om.* GC 17 habe] avia PL, E, hebbe SN2, P3, era che V, *om.* N1, GC ||  
 passaria (SN1)] passara PL, P1, M1, paxaro N1, V, GC, passariano F, P2 19 *tit. add.* N1,  
 SN2, P3, *cap.* 47 (49B) et 48 (50B) uniti SN1

*from the Crucifixion nails, now preserved in S. Patrizia. Other such filings performed various miracles. Patricia died on her return from Constantinople; her body miraculously indicated the site where her monastery now stands, and the nuns returned there.*

Patricia nepote de lo imperatore predicto fece allora anche vuto alo 5  
 tissimo Dio che se epsa liberata era sana et salva de quillo periculo si  
 se inchyudeva in vita claustrali et viverria in vita monastica cole dompne  
 monache a lo servizio de Dio. Per lo quale vuto como pervenne in Napoli  
 diligentemente adinpliò et ordinò colò imperatore suo ciano che certe  
 calore o vero monache lequale observavano vita monastica che omne una 10  
 de propria voluntate ad uno loco loro o vero oratorio lo quale chymato  
 era Sancto Nicandro o viro Sancto Marciano posto depresso alo foro o  
 vero alo palazzo dove se tenea la corte et deffeniano le questiune, lu quale  
 loco ogi chymato è Sancta Patricia, che in sua compagna ad servire Dio  
 se.nde gessero in uno luoco o vero scoglyo dentro mare. Lu quale luoco in 15  
 quillo tempo chymato era la insula de lo Salvatore ala quale de poy vi fo  
 hedificato uno magnyo et forte castello lu quale ogi è chymato lo Castello  
 dell'Ovo deloquale adereto è facta mencione. Unde le dicte monache con  
 Patricia in vita bona in religione reclusa incomenczarono nelo predicto  
 scoglyo con grande devocione et in penitencia servire a Dio. 20

---

5 nepote] neza E || allora] om. PL, P1, F, N1, P2, E, SN2, P3 || anche] om, PL, E, ancora SN2, P3 6 sana et salva] om. SN1 7 inchyudeva] piu dea N1, inchiuderia F, P2, E || viverria] vivea N1, E || monastica cole] delle PL, E, monastica come le GC 8 monache] che add. SN1 || a lo ... Dio] om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || Per] om. PL, E || quale] cosa et per lo quale add. V || como] om. V 9 ciano] cio E, SN1 9-11 che certe ... voluntate] andare con certe altre donne che per [per: om. P2] loro bona volonta se renchiusero monache et andaro F, P2 10 calore o vero] om. E, con loro e vero GC || observavano] observano P1, N1, observano castitate et GC || che] om. PL, E 11 ad ... loco] uno lo lo GC 11-12 chymato era] se chiamava in vulgare PL, chiama in vulgare E || chymato ... Marciano] è chiamato et era V 12 o viro] e PL, E || posto] di sopra overo add. E || alo foro] di for a V 13 et] che F, P2 14 ogi ... è] mo se chiama PL, se chiama E || che] om. GC 14-15 che in ... vero] et poi ne andaro ad uno F, P2 14 in sua compagna] om. PL, E || ad] et GC 15 se.nde gessero] se dignassero GC || gessero] andassero V || o] in GC 15-18 Lu quale luoco ... mencione] Dil qual luogho in quel tempo una parte se chiamava insola dil Salvatore et mo se chiama il Castello dill'Ovo PL, E 15 luoco] om. F, P2 16 ala quale] et F, P2 17 et] multo add. P2 || forte] fortissimo GC || castello] antro de add. V || lu quale] om. GC 18-19 Unde ... Patricia] Le quali monache partite da quel luogho, la predicta Patricia chon alchune soe compagnie PL, E || con Patricia] om. V 19 in vita ... reclusa] in riligione et vita rinchiusa PL, E, in religiosa et bona vita in penitentia et devotione F, P2 || bona] una GC || in religione] con bona religione V, et in religione SN1 || reclusa] repiusa N1 19-20 nelo ... penitencia] in del dicto luogho PL, E, om. F, P2

Et in uno certo tempo poy Patricia se partiò da Napoli et tornò in Costantinopoli. Et da Elena matre de Costantino et sua ava donare se fece una certa parte de ferro de li chyovi coli quali chyavato fo in croce lo nostro signyore Ihu xpo. De lo quale ferro forgiato fo uno chyovo ad similitudine de li veri chyove che chyavato fo Ihu xpo nelo lignyo de la croce, de la quale croce et chyovi sancta Helena grande divocione et oracione et reverencia conservava. 5

Et per una grande dignita et vera reliquia la dicta Patricia si lo portò con epsa in dela cita de Napoli. Et gionta nelo predicto suo loco con grande reverencia lo fece ponere et conservare in de lo dicto loco loquale chyavo per fine alo di d'ogi appare nelo dicto monasterio de Sancta Patricia multo venerabilemente conservato. Et per fortificare la fede de lo nostro signyore Ihu xpo et de quilli che fermamente credeno, lo predicto chyovo nelo dicto monasterio se mostra publicamente lo Vernadi Sancto. Per la quale cosa cresse multo la divocione ali devoti xpiani che da quillo di il vedeno pyu che de li altri. 10 15

---

1 Et in] *om.* N1, SN1, SN2, P3 || Et ... certo] Laquale socciedendo non troppo *PL, E* || poy] che *add.* N1, SN2, P3, *om.* P2 1-2 et tornò ... Costantinopoli] *om.* P2 1 tornò] andò P1, F, N1, SN2, P3 2 da] *om.* V, E || et sua ava] *om.* E || donare se] dinarisce V 3 de ferro ... chyovi] le chiovi de ferro V || ferro] di uno *add.* PL, E, et *add.* N1 || coli quali] *repet.* P1 || fo] *om.* P2 || in croce] *om.* GC 3-4 in croce ... signyore] *om.* V 4 De lo ... fo] li quali ferri fo in GC || ferro] misto chon altro ferro *add.* PL || fo] fe SN1 5 veri chyove] piovì N1, virchioni GC || Ihu] xpo V, *om.* PL, N1, E || nelo] in su V 5-6 nelo ... la] in PL, E 6 de la quale (P1)] la quale PL, M1, E, SN1, GC, et quilli V, et la dicta F, P2 || de la quale croce] *om.* P3 || croce et] *om.* V || Helena] abe *add.* N1, SN2, P3, portati havea in Chierusalem li quali con *add.* SN1 6-7 grande ... conservava] avia portati da Jherusalem et concervavali chon divote oratione dipresso di ley PL, E, portato havea da Yerusalem, li quali con gran divocion et reverentia conservao V, la tenia in grande reverentia F, P2 7 reverencia] in reverencia lle N1, in reverencia SN2, P3 || conservava] reservava P1 8 Et] il quale chiovo PL, E || et vera] o vero SN1, GC 9 dela cita de] *om.* PL, E || gionta] arrivata F, P2 9-10 gionta ... reverencia] *om.* PL, E 10 ponere] reponere F, P2, SN2, P3 || de lo dicto loco] isso F, P2 || loco] *om.* N1 10-11 loquale chyavo ... dicto] dove mo sta il PL, dove mo sta nel E 11 chyavo] chiamato GC || dicto] luoco et *add.* V || de] le dompne monache il quale se chiama *add.* PL, le dicte monache il quale è chiamato E 12 multo ... conservato] et per fi mo se se conserva multo venerabilemente PL, *om.* E || fortificare] notificare P2 || la fede] li pedi GC 12-13 lo nostro ... Ihu] *om.* PL, E 13 fermamente] *om.* PL, E || credeno] credeano a V, credevano E, GC 13-14 lo predicto ... monasterio] sia a tucti manifesto che quel chiovo PL, E 14 lo] il giorno di PL, E 15 per] *om.* V || Per ... multo] Et per lo vedere dil quel chiovo si cresce PL, E 15-16 ali devoti ... altri] e maximamente a quegli ch'el vedeno in quel giorno piu che in altro tempo avendo gran contreczione di mente e memoria dillor peccati PL, E 15 devoti xpiani] veri cristiani et devoti F, fedeli cristiani et devoti P2 || da] in F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 16 il] illi GC



Et nelo dicto chyovo apparenno certe vene rosse quasi como de sangue. De li quali veri chyovi che fo su lo lignyo de la croce chyavato lo nostro signyore Ihu xpo si foro incorporati et misti co altro ferro et factone uno freno alo cavallo de Costantino lu quale era uno singularo et bono cavallo et di smisurata persona et fortecza et tanto isfrenato che non si potea tenere et in percio niuno homo cavalcare lo potea. Ma da poy che misso li fo quillo freno tornò pyu mansueto che una pecora. Sopra alo quale cavallo cavalcò Costantino inperatore multe fiате in bactaglya et con prosperita sempre fo vectoriuso et subiugò multe provincie de lo mundo. Et della limatura de lo dicto ferro fo consacrato lo mare Adriano loquale navigare non se potea. Et per la dicta consacracione lo dicto mare si navigò como ogi se vede.

La dicta sancta Patricia tornando da Costantinopoli si moriò in mare et rendiò la sua anima a Dio et la nave arrecò lo suo corpo ala marina de Napoli. Et como forono le soy compaignye ionte, stavano in dubio dello honore che fare li deveano nelo suo exequio et in quale loco sepellire la devessero. Unde per revelacione divina alo duca che la dicta cita de Napoli regeva se.nde andaro et supplicaroli caramente che loro concedere

1 Et] che in quel midesmo giorno *add. PL*, in quel medesimo giorno *add. E* || apparenno ... rosse] certi venerabili cose *GC* || certe] tucte *E* || vene] di ferro *add. PL, E* || quasi] quasi misto di color rosso *PL*, miste de color rosso *E* 2-3 De li quali ... misti] Dall'altre parte dil ferro dil dicto chiovo la qual fo incorporata e mista *PL, E* 2 fo] *om. P2*, foro *GC* 2-3 lo nostro ... Ihu] *om. V* 3 incorporati et misti] composito *P2* || ferro] *om. V* || et factone] diloqual per revelacione divina fo facto *PL, E* 4 freno] ferro *N1* 5 di smisurata ... et] *om. PL, E* || et] che era *F, P2* 6 in percio] che *PL, E, om. N1, SN2, P3* || homo] *om. F, P2*, pero *add. P3* || cavalcare] cavalcatore *V*, cavaleri *GC* || che] cio è *V, om. E* 7 freno] ferro *N1* || tornò pyu] fo facto multo *PL*, fo facto *E*, piu humili et *P2*, humili et *add. GC* || che una pecora] al cavalcare *PL, E* || pecora] pecorella *F, P2* 8 cavalcò] cavalcato *V, om. P2, SN1* 8-9 cavalcò ... vectoriuso et] Gostantino combactendo multe fiате si *PL, E* || et ... prosperita] tornava com presperita et *V* 9-10 lo mundo] barbaria *PL, E* 10 della] la *V* || ferro] freno *SN1* 11-12 Et per ... vede] *om. PL, E* 12 si] consacrò *add. F*, consacrò et *add. P2* || navigò] naviga *SN1* || como] secundo como *P1, F, N1, SN2*, secundo *P2*, si como *P3* || ogi] allo di *add. P1, N1, F, P2*, en di *add. V* lo di *SN2, P3* 13 sancta] *om. SN2, P3* || da] ad *N1, SN2, P3* 14 arrecò] adusse *PL, E*, portò *F, P2, SN1* 15 et como] *om. V* || ionte] *om. V* || stavano in dubio] dobitavano *PL, E*, stavano *GC* 15-16 dello honore che] que honore *PL, E*, quale honore *F, P2* 16 deveano] deano *N1* 16-17 et in ... devessero] *om. E* 17 la devessero] se dovesse *P2* || divina alo] divi alo *SN2*, duvalo *P3* || che] ebbe *add. V* 17-18 la dicta ... Napoli] la dicta cita *P2*, Napoli *E* 18 Napoli] et che la *add. V* || se.nde andaro] *om. P1*, essendo andati *E* 18-231.1 se.nde ... devesse] li fo facta supplicatione per le dicte monache compaignie de la dicta santa Patricia che li piacesse concederli *F, P2* 18 caramente] *om. PL, V, E*, certamente *SN2, P3* || loro] esso *PL, om. V* 18-231.1 loro concedere dovesse] a.loro contendere *GC*, li concedesse *E*

devesse duy non domati ienchi. Et obtenuta la gracia et havuti li genchi habero uno carro et giunti li duy genchi non domati et postoni lo sancto corpo de Patricia su, et facto loro asprecza de bastunati, sencza guida niuna foro lassati andare ad cio che andassero dove ipsi volevano. Li quali genchi traversando le strate de la citate de Napoli dericto per certi viche 5 per volere de Dio portareno quillo sancto corpo dove è ogi lo predicto monasterio chyamato per la predicta dompna sancta Patricia.

Le quale monache habitavano como in quisto capitulo è dicto dove è ogi lo Castello dell'Ovo. Unde di poy la morte de questa sancta dompna riale per certi liciti occasiune vi ritornaro alo predicto monasterio ov'è anche le dompne monache che conservano et guardano lo sopradicto chyovo coll'altre reliquie sancte como sopra è narrato. 10 15

## 49 (51B)

*In 535, the emperor Justinian sent Belisarius to free Naples from the Goths, whom the Neapolitans were too lazy to resist. Belisarius expelled the Goths and killed almost all the Neapolitans. The city was repopulated by men from nearby cities, and from that time to this, Neapolitan blood has been contaminated.* 20

1 duy] *om.* V || ienchi] vitelli PL, E || Et ... gracia] el dicto duca per satisfare a.llozo pregharie gli conciese i dicti vitelli PL, E || Et obtenuta ... havuti] ale quale foro concessi et pilgiati F P2 || genchi] dicti vitelli PL, *om.* E 2 habero] pigliaro PL, E || giunti] vi V || giunti ... domati] agionserovi questi duo vitelli PL, aggiunti li doi vitelli al carro E || duy ... domati] insiem F P2 || sancto] dicto V, *om.* F, P2 3 su] di sovra PL, suso V, *om.* E, SN2 || et] fo *add.* F, P2 || facto ... bastunati] *om.* PL, E || guida] crido E 4 niuna] alchuna PL, E || ad cio ... volevano] dove che a loro piacque E || volevano] volessero V 5 genchi] vitegli PL, *om.* E || traversando ... viche] per drecta via prey vichi traversando andando PL, per diricta via per li vichi traversando E || le strate de] per F, P2 || dericto ... viche] *om.* F, P2 || viche] vie N1, P3, SN2 6 per] com V || volere] volunta N1, GC, SN2, P3 || portareno] portato E || sancto] *om.* F, P2, GC || dove] unde GC || dove ... lo] al PL, E || predicto] sancto corpo allo *add.* V 7 chyamato ... Patricia] il quale mo si chiama Santa Patricia et in quel luogho fo sepellito PL, E || dompna] *om.* F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 8 habitavano] habitano V 9 dicto] de sopra *add.* GC 10 lo] in GC 10-11 la morte de] de F, N1, *om.* P2, SN2, P3 || la morte ... dompna] e la morta dopna de questa GC 11 sancta] *om.* SN1 || dompna] *om.* F, P2 12 ritornaro] retornare V 13-14 ov'è anche le] dove anche so P1, F, V, P2, SN1, GC, dove ancora so N1, SN2, P3 14 che] et P2 15 chyovo] loco N1 18 *tit. add.* N1, SN2, P3

Inello tempo de lo inperatore Iustiniano i goti populi pervennero in Ytalia et Napoli occuparo. La quale cosa como illo sappe Iustiniano mandò comandando ali napolitane che devessero expellere et via mandare li dicti goti. Li napolitani portandosi pigre alo dicto mandamento resposino alo inperatore che resistere non poteano ala potencia et crudelita de li goti. 5 Unde lo imperatore comandò ad Belisario lo quale era maystro de sua cavallaria, homo nobele et extrenuo in arme, che devesse subito andare in de la cita de Napoli et per forcza de arme devesse expellere li goti. Lo quale Belisario subito hobediò alo comandamento de lo inperatore et iuncto che fo là fo cazato per forcza li goti da Napoli et uccisene multe 10 de ipsi. Et di poy crudelissimamente uccise tucti li napolitani et quasi ale dompne non perdonò, sulo li homine ecclesiastice. Et cossi Napoli fo in tucto destructa et dessolata. Et da poy habitata fo per homine pervenuti da fore delle cita et castella convecine, cio è de Capua, Sorrento, Amalfe et de Atella. Et da quillo tempo in qua fo contaminato lo sangue napolitano. 15 Et questo fo in de li anni de nostro signyore C<sup>v</sup> XXXV.

## 50 (52B)

*A long Saracen seige of Naples in 787, in which Naples was aided by Charlemagne, King Desiderius of Lombardy, and men from Apulia and Calabria, ended in a great battle on St Paul's Day. Naples was freed but its 20 fighting men were all killed. Noblemen and commoners from nearby towns*

1 Inello tempo] in quillo P<sub>1</sub>, in quillo tempo V, N<sub>1</sub> || Iustiniano] Constantino E || populi] om. F, P<sub>2</sub> 2 occuparo] per add. N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 2–3 mandò comandando] mandò comandano P<sub>1</sub>, comandò PL, E, mandò comandamento GC 3 et via mandare] om. PL, E, et via andare GC 4 portandosi] portarose V, partendosi P<sub>3</sub> || mandamento] comandamento PL, F, P<sub>2</sub>, E, SN<sub>1</sub>, GC, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 5 et crudelita] om. F, P<sub>2</sub> 6 Unde] et impero PL, et impercio E 7 homo] om. N<sub>1</sub> || extrenuo] determino E, extremo GC || in arme] om. PL, E 8 de ... de] om. PL, E || arme] om. E || expellere] cacciare F, P<sub>2</sub> 9 Lo quale (N<sub>1</sub>) li quali comandamenti P<sub>1</sub>, li quali M<sub>1</sub> || subito hobediò] obedite E 10 iuncto ... goti] cazati li goti PL, li cazò E || che fo] che P<sub>1</sub>, om. F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || là] vi V, ad Napoli F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, om. SN<sub>1</sub> || fo cazato] cazò V, SN<sub>1</sub>, lle cazò N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, foro cazati GC 10–11 fo cazato ... ipsi] fe bactalgia coli dicti goti et sconfixeli et caccioli da la dicta cita et multi de loro foro uccisi [uccisi: morti P<sub>2</sub>] F, P<sub>2</sub> 10 li goti] om. N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 10–11 et uccisene ... quasi] uczieste crudelissimamente che quasi PL 10 uccisene] foronde uccisi N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 11 crudelissimamente] crudelmente E || tucti] om. F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 12 non perdonò] perdonare non valeano ma SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || sulo] ni a PL, E, reservati F, P<sub>2</sub> || Napoli fo] om. N<sub>1</sub>, quasi add. SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 13 et dessolata] om. P<sub>1</sub>, F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || habitata] rehabitata PL, E || pervenuti] pervenendono PL, che venero E, pervenenti V 14 convecine] vicine et non vicine PL, E || cio è] om. P<sub>1</sub>, N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 15 Atella] et da altri lochi add. F, P<sub>2</sub> || da] a E || quillo tempo] allora F, P<sub>2</sub> || in qua] om. PL, E 16 et] per add. GC || fo] om. F, P<sub>2</sub> || de nostro signyore] domini PL, E, de xpo F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || C<sup>v</sup>] V<sup>o</sup> SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 17 tit. add. N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>

*and distant lands were invited repopulate it, whence Neapolitan blood was contaminated for the second time.*

In delo anno de la incarnacione de xpo C<sup>vii</sup> lxxxviii, essendo in dela ecclesia de Dio papa Andriano primo de nacione romano et allo inperio de Roma Carlo Magno et in Ytalia Desiderio et Aldigisio figlyoli suoy ri de Lombardia, vennero li sarracini de le parte de Africa et di Spagnya con exercito de nave et con copiosa multitudene de gente. Desseseno ala marina de Napoli et discorrendo per tucto lo payse convicino si destrussero tucta la regione, cio è le cita et le terre et lochi debili, ponendo ad taglyo de spata tucti li xpiani liquali prendevano non perdonando ne a. ffemene ne a. ffanzulli ne ad vecchye. Et di poy districtissimamente assediario la cita de Napoli. Et venendo lo ultimo dì de iugnyo, indelo quale dì si celebra et fa la festa de sancto Paulo apostolo, incomenzaro et dederò la bactaglya per volere prendere la cita de Napoli per forcza. Unde intrareno per la porta che è chyamata ogi Dompno Urso per le cave facte socto terra et con distrugimento et grande uccisione de li citadine piglyaro tucto quillo terreno loquale è da la predicta Porta Dompno Urso per fine alo palaczo de lo inperatore cossi chyamato, cio è al fuoro.

Et in quillo tempo, per parte de lo re Desiderio, era duca et rectore de Napoli uno homo dutato de multa sapiencia et extrenuitate chyamato Theofilio. Lu quale una colo populo de Napoli pervenendo denanti alo

3 de xpo] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3, de lo nostro signor Ihu xpo GC || C<sup>vii</sup> lxxxviii (P1) C<sup>viii</sup> lxxxviii M1, C<sup>vii</sup> lxxxviii V, vii lxxxviii SN2 4 primo ... romano] *om. PL, V, E || inperio] imperator V 5 de Roma] *om. PL, de re N1, romano SN1 || figlyoli ... ri] suo figliolo re F, V, N1, P2, SN2, P3 6 Lombardia] longobardi E 7 gente] gene N1 8 convicino] continuo GC 9 la regione ... et] li F, P2 || regione] religione V, GC || cio è] Nola *add. PL, E || le terre] lo terreno GC || debili] vicini PL, E 10 liquali] *om. P3 || non perdonando] *om. N1 11 a. ffemene] assidiero *add. PL || a. ffanzulli] ad mascoli E, ad mascoli ne a. ffanzulli GC || vecchye] vecchi ne a vecchie SN2, P3 || districtissimamente] distructissimamente GC, astrittissimamente SN2, P3 12 venendo] *om. F, P2 || dì] giorno E, *om. SN1, GC || iugnyo] luglio SN2 12-13 in ... dì] nell'ora che F, che P2 13 celebra et] *om. PL, E, celebrava et V, N1, SN2, P3, celebrava la messa et F, P2 || fa] facea F, N1, P2, E, P3, SN2 || Paulo] Petro SN1 13-14 incomenzaro ... la] li dederò la prima F, li decrerò la prima P2 14 et dederò] ad dare N1, P3, SN2 || et dederò ... bactaglya] *om. E || et dederò ... per] *om. PL || per forcza] *om. F, P2 15 che ... ogi] di PL, E || ogi] *om. N1 16 terra] et con distrugimento tucto quello terreno lo quale è della predicta Porta Don Orso per la cava facta socta terra *add. V || et con] etiam GC || grande] *om. E, grandissima GC || de] gente de *add. GC 17 piglyaro (N1)] piglyato M1, P1, *om. E || loquale] ogi *add. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || Porta] *om. V 18 cossi chyamato] *om. PL, E 19 Desiderio] che *add. V || duca] ditto P3, SN2 || rectore] re GC 20 multa] grandissima GC || extrenuitate (N1)] extrenuitate P1, M1, GC 21 Theofilio] Deyfilo V, N1, Cheofilaro E || denanti] di nocte V**********************

predicto palaczo dove se scontrò con sarracine in grande bactaglya dove  
 se portò virili et constantemente, el primo scontro fo percosso et passato  
 de una lancza et morto. Subitamente li napolitani non dubitaro nienti  
 anci andati et constantemente resistivano et contraponevano li corpi morti  
 como mura denanti ali dicti sarracine. Et essendo in quillo dì una aspres- 5  
 sima bactaglia inter li napolitani et sarracine predicti, di certo la victoria  
 se sperava per li sarracine senza alcuno dubio. Allora Aldigioso lu quale  
 era andato per succurso alo re Carlo Magno ionse con grande quan-  
 tita de gente in adiuto de li napolitane. Vero è che illi stavano actendati  
 al core in uno luoco dove se chyama Canpo ad Carlo et da quillo luoco 10  
 mandò Aymone et Bernardo duy duca con duy milia cavalli et pedune  
 dece milia liquali trovareno ala cita de Napoli. In quillo iorno che la bac-  
 taglya era durissima in de la hora de nona et per la venuta de questa gente,  
 ali napolitani pervenne grande animo, liquali erano multo fatigati. Et li  
 sarracine habera disperacione et timore, li quali sarracine non potendono 15  
 pyu dorare, como genti venta si possino in rocta et in fuga. Et fugendono  
 se partero de la cita et fermarose coli loro paviglyune per stancia in uno

1 dove] ivi *PL, E*, et ivi *V*, loco *SN1* || dove ... bactaglya] *om. N1* || scontrò] incontraro  
*SN2, P3* || in] et con *P3, SN2* 1-2 in grande ... portò] *om. PL, E* 2 virili] virilmente  
*E, GC*, multo virilmente *F, P2* 2-3 et constantemente ... subitamente] de in la quale  
 bactaglia fo morto de la quale morte *F, P2* 2 scontro] scontrato *GC*, incontro *SN2,*  
*P3* 3 et morto subitamente] dove di subito moriò *SN2, P3* || subitamente] subito  
 nientemeno *PL, E* 3-4 non dubitaro ... constantemente] combactendo audacamente *PL,*  
*E* 3 dubitaro (*SN1*) toccaro *P1*, doctaro *M1, F, V, N1, P2* 4 anci] ma innanti *N1, SN2,*  
*P3*, ante *SN1* || andati] andigiario *V*, audace *SN1* || andati ... resistivano] come valenti  
 homini resistero ala bactaglia durissimamente *F, P2* || constantemente] constrictamente  
*GC* || corpi] omini *F, P2* 5 mura] narra *V*, mira? *SN1* || denanti] *om. PL, E*, l'uno sopra  
 l'altro per resistere *F, P2* || quillo dì] quelli de *P3* || dì] giorno *PL, F, E, P2* 6 inter  
 ... predicti] *om. F, P2* || di certo] certe *V* || victoria] bactaglia *F, P2* 7-8 Allora ...  
 andato] et exendo andato Aldegioso *F, P2* 7 Aldigioso] Aldioso *GC* 8 ionse] tornò  
 ad Napoli *N1, SN2, P3*, como piacque a Dio in questo venne *F, P2* 9 illi ... actendati]  
 li stava athendato *V, E, SN1*, quilli che stavano actendati *GC* 9-10 illi ... core] pussero  
 loro tende ad core *F*, pusero lore fede ad core *P2* 10 core] choro *E*, thoro *SN1* ||  
 core in] thoro *PL, om. V*, core et *N1* 11 Bernardo] ambi *add. SN1* || duy ... et] *om. E* ||  
 pedune] appedi *SN1* 12 trovareno] intrarono *PL, SN1*, intrati *E* 12-13 ala cita ... in  
 de] che in quillo di et de la cita de Napoli era durissima bactaglia et era in su *N1, SN2,*  
*P3* || in quillo ... nona] che in quel giorno fo [fo: se *P2*] faceva durissima bactaglia *F, P2*  
 13 hora] via *GC* || questa gente] questi *E* 14 pervenne] ionse *E* || grande] grandissimo  
*GC* || grande animo] et crebe grande audacia *PL*, grande audacia *E* || liquali] per che *P3,*  
*SN2* || fatigati] affannati et in pagura *F*, affandati in pagura *P2*, fatigate deli sarracini *GC*  
 14-15 li ... timore] gran timore e disperacione pervenne ay sarrayni *PL, E* 15 habera]  
*om. F*, in *P2*, multa *add. GC* || disperacione et] *om. SN1*, gran *add. GC* 15-235.5 li  
 ... sarracine] *om. E* 15 potendono] poteano *GC* 16 como genti venta] *om. V* ||  
 genti venta] a venciotti *PL, E*, gente rocta *GC* || in rocta et] *om. PL, E, GC* 17 partero]  
 levaro *P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || coli ... stancia] *om. F, P2* || stancia in] instantia de *GC*

luoco de fore de la cita chyamato Castaglyola et Malaczano dove demoraro per spacio de mise sey et iorni XXV, distrugendo et diguastando tucto lo tenimento de la cita de Napoli. Et fecero bactaglye per fine ali XXV iorni de jennaro. In de lo quale luoco infra quisto tempo li sarracine certi ingegnye fecero de lignyame per destrugere le mura et spisso 5 le assaglyvano quasi omne septimana. Davano grande assalto ale dicte mura in de li quali assalti morero multa gente dall'una parte et dall'otra. In quillo iorno che fo la bactaglya forono morti de cavaliere napolitani CCCC XXVII et feriti C<sup>v</sup> X, et de li feriti ne foro morti X et de li popolari de Napoli ne foro morti mille et octocento et pyu, et li homine de li casali et dele castella forono morti tre milia et X. Et de li cavaliere francische li quali venuti erano alo succurso de la cita de Napoli ne foro morti C<sup>v</sup>XL. Et ferito ne fo lo duca de Oppido de la quale ferita n'è morto. Et deli pagani ne foro morti pyu de quaranta duy milia homine in tanto che lo sangue corse per fine alo mare. Inter li quale sarracine in de la dicta bactaglya fo morto Fontan re de Africa, Eydron re de Vocia de Cartagine, et Marchunath re de Persia et de Soria. 15

Ancora ad Aymone et ad Bernardo duca de Franca si vennero in succurso multi cavaliere et semelemente per dare adiuto ali napolitane

1 chyamato] il quale se chiamava *PL*, el qual se chiama *E*, che era chiamata *V* || Castaglyola] Castignola *V*, *N*<sub>1</sub>, *P*<sub>2</sub>, *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> || Malaczano] Malagano *GC* 2 spacio de] *om.* *N*<sub>1</sub> || sey] seu *VI* *add.* *P*<sub>1</sub> || iorni XXV] piu *F*, *P*<sub>2</sub> || XXV] XXII *E* 2-3 distrugendo ... lo] facendo gran dapno alo *F*, *P*<sub>2</sub> 2 diguastando] divastando *PL* 3 fecero] multe *add.* *PL*, *E* || fecero bactaglye] facendo sempre meschia insieme *F*, facendo mechia insieme *P*<sub>2</sub> || fine ali] *om.* *GC* 4 iorni] di *F*, *om.* *P*<sub>2</sub>, *SN*<sub>1</sub>, *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> 5 certi] *om.* *GC* || fecero] ordinaro *PL*, *E* || et spisso] de Napuli et *F*, *P*<sub>2</sub> 6 le assaglyvano] *om.* *PL*, *E*, et *N*<sub>1</sub>, *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> || quasi] *om.* *F*, *P*<sub>2</sub> || Davano] dando *F*, danno *P*<sub>2</sub> 6-7 ale dicte ... assalti] *om.* *V* 7 multa gente] multi *E* || dall'otra] ma *add.* *F*, *P*<sub>2</sub> 8 che ... bactaglya] *om.* *PL*, *E* || fo] *om.* *P*<sub>1</sub> || napolitani] de Napoli *V* 9 CCCC] CCC *GC* || XXVII] XXVI *V*, XXVIII *P*<sub>2</sub> || C<sup>v</sup>] C<sup>v</sup> *V*, V<sup>c</sup> *N*<sub>1</sub>, V<sup>m</sup>? *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> || C<sup>v</sup> X] C<sup>ii</sup> *E* || de li ... morti] dalli venuti da fora *V* || ne] che *E* || X] pochi *F*, *P*<sub>2</sub>, multi *SN*<sub>1</sub>, *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> 10 de Napoli ... pyu] 1800 *SN*<sub>1</sub> 10-11 mille ... morti] *om.* *P*<sub>2</sub> 10 octocento] C<sup>viii</sup> *V* || li] piu *P*<sub>3</sub> || li homine de] da *V* 11 tre milia et X] tre milia et piu *N*<sub>1</sub>, piu de tre milia *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> 11-12 francische] de Franca *E* 12 li quali ... erano] che vennero *F*, *P*<sub>2</sub> || li quali ... ne] *om.* *PL*, *E* || ne ... morti] *om.* *V* 13 C<sup>v</sup>XL] C<sup>iii</sup> e deli pedoni di francia fuoron morti C<sup>v</sup> XL *PL*, C<sup>ii</sup> XL *E*, V<sup>m</sup> XXXX *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> || duca] conte *P*<sub>2</sub> 14 pagani] pani *E* || quaranta duy] quattro *V*, quaranta *E*, XLVII *N*<sub>1</sub>, XXXXIII *SN*<sub>1</sub> || homine] *om.* *PL*, *F*, *E*, *P*<sub>2</sub> 15 alo mare] alle mure *V* 15-16 in ... bactaglya] *om.* *F*, *N*<sub>1</sub>, *P*<sub>2</sub>, *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> 16 fo morto] fo in uno *PL*, *E*, *om.* *GC* || Fontan re] forati *E*, affrontate re *GC* || Eydron] Exdion *PL*, Esdron *V*, Fidion *E*, Eydem *F*, *N*<sub>1</sub>, *P*<sub>2</sub>, Exdron *SN*<sub>1</sub>, Eiaron *GC*, Eiden *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> || Vocia] Bocia et *PL*, Boetia et *E*, Votia et *F*, *N*<sub>1</sub>, *P*<sub>2</sub>, *SN*<sub>1</sub>, *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> 17 Soria] Scitia *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub> 18 ad] *om.* *V*, *SN*<sub>1</sub>, *GC* 18-236.1 ad Aymone ... gente] alo dicto axedio vi venne in agiuto de napolitani et de Aymone et Bernardo duchi de Franca multy cavaleri et gente de Pulgia et da Calabria *F*, *P*<sub>2</sub> 18 ad] *om.* *V*, *SN*<sub>1</sub> 19 succurso] con *add.* *SN*<sub>1</sub> || cavaliere] citadini *V* || semelemente] *om.* *PL*, *E* finalmente *V*

vi vendero ricercati da ipse da Puglya et Calabria multa gente, et tucti intraro nella cita de Napoli ali XVI di de decembro. Et essendone adunata grande gente in Napoli fecero consiglyo una coli napolitani et deliberato, insero ad combactere in campo ali di XXV de lo mese de iennaro in de lo quale di se celebrava la festa de sancto Paulo apostolo. Et alo levare de lo sole, ordinate le schyere de li cavalli et ordinato chi devea soccorrere et alle rescosse et dati li signyali, si se incomenczò la bactaglya crudelissima de la quale bactaglya la victoria era dubia per fine passata hora de nona. In de la quale hora li sarracine incomenczarono ad diminuyre et li xpiani, operante la divina gracia, ad vincere in tale maniera che finalmente che li sarracine venczuti da li xpiani descamparo poco et tucti li altri forono uccise et taglyati per bocca de spata et sequitati per fine ale nave. Deli quali navilii ne forono arsi et brusati pyu de quaranta et l'altre nave con alquanti sarracine scamparono. Unde forono morti in quella bactaglya de li cavalieri francischi sencza li altri de accoglyensa LVI. Inter li quali ce foro morti Aymone con quactro figlyoli li quali sepelliti forono ala ecclesia de Sancto Ianuario fore la cita de Napoli ad una profunda grocta

1 vi vendero] *om. PL, E*, et venendo *GC* || ricercati da ipse] da recerchati *V, om. GC* || ipse] essi cio è *PL, E* || Calabria] con *add. SN1* || multa gente] *om. PL, E* 1-2 tucti ... de] intrato in *E* 2 intraro] armaro *P2* || XVI di] LXVI *PL*, sedeci giorni *E*, XXV di *P3, SN2* 2-4 XVI di ... di] *om. N1* 2 di] *om. V, P2, SN1, GC* 2-3 essendone ... deliberato] facto consiglio choy napolitani *PL, E* 3 grande] tanta quantita de *F, P2*, grandesseme *GC*, grandissima quantita de *SN2, P3* || gente] *om. P1* || fecero] facendo *SN2, P3* || fecero consiglyo] et facto consilio fra loro *F, P2* 3-4 et ... insero] de quillo ad fare avessero, deliberato de uscire *F, P2* || deliberato insero] deliberato de ensire *V*, deliberato essere *GC*, delliberato uscire *SN2, P3* 4 campo] con sarracini et usciero fora yschierati et in ordine *add. F, P2* || di] *om. SN1* || XXV] XXII di *E* || de lo mese] di *F, om. V, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 5 di] *om. GC* || celebrava] celebra *SN1* || festa] conversacione *V* 6 de li ... et] *om. SN1* || cavalli] et dili pedoni *add. PL, E* 6-7 chi ... rescosse] laltre per soccorrere *PL, E* || et alle rescosse] *om. F, P2* 7 bactaglya] durissima et *add. N1, SN2, P3* || crudelissima] crudele *GC* 7-8 crudelissima ... bactaglya] *om. E* || crudelissima ... dubia] la quale bactalgia fo crudelissima et dubiosa *F*, fo crudelissima et dubiosa *P2* 9 hora] de nona *add. SN1* || incomenczarono] *om. SN1* 10 operante] o per arte e per *E*, mediante *F, P2* 10-12 ad vincere ... spata] foro victoriosi, finalmente li sarracini forono sconficti et morti et presi tanto che pochi ne scamparo *F, P2* 10 tale] *om. SN1* || che finalmente] *om. SN2, P3* 11 venczuti] uniti *SN1* || descamparo] scampandonde *PL, E* || poco ... forono] pochi che non fossero *N1, SN2, P3* || et ... altri] *om. PL, E* 12 bocca] fil *V*, taglio *N1, SN2, P3* 12-13 Deli quali ... brusati] in tanto che ne foro brusciate *F, P2* 13 navilii] nave *GC* || ne ... quaranta] la piu parte fu abruaxata *E*, navi *add. F* || arsi et brusati] abrusati *N1*, brusciati *SN2, P3*, arsi *SN1* 13-14 nave ... sarracine] *om. F, P2* 14 alquanti] alchuni dei *PL, E* || Unde] *om. E* || bactaglya] in quel iorno *add. E* 15 sencza ... accoglyensa] *om. F, P2* || LVI] 66 *V* 16 ce ... morti] se conta che vi fo *PL, E* || forono] *om. E* 17 ecclesia] grocta *PL, E* || fore] et forono de *V* 17-237.1 de Napoli ... appare] *om. PL, E*

laquale ogi ne appare, et Aldegisio figlyolo de lo re Desidero, lo corpo de lo quale Aldegisio fo mandato alo patre in Lombardia. Et de li napolitani et delle castella convecine forone morti CC cavaliere et duy milia peduni. Et de sarracine forono morti deyce milia.

Et per questo la cita de Napoli tornò ad tale partito che non nche 5  
remasi cavaliere ne combactetore. Et lo populo de Napoli, vedendonosi  
quasi tucti destructi et che la maiore parte erano morti, si feceno chya-  
mare homine delle citate et castella convecine et da alcune altre parte,  
ali quali proffersero de dare per muglyere tanto le virgine citelle quanto  
le vedue remase de li morti cavaliere con tucti li loro bieni. Et questo 10  
feceno bandire et divulgare per un trombecta in deverse parte el quale era  
trombecta de Aymone. Per lo quale banno e chyamata, in breve tempo  
vi vennero multi tanto cavaliere quanto popolare cio è da Capua, da  
Nola, da l'Acerra, da Sorrento, da Amalfi et da Atella ala quale fama  
vi vennero multi probi homine da Calabria, da Puglya, da Grecia, et 15  
da Africa de presso ad Tunise, donde habe origine et principio Augu-  
stino glorioso doctore, ancora Lebrondio suo caro amico, et Paulo Orisio  
suo amico et dissipulo sufficiente venendo da Africa lo pontefece sancto  
Gaudiuso lu quale poy facto fo viscopo de Sarno da Papa Andriano lu

---

1 et] morto *add. N1, SN2, P3*, moriò *add. F, P2* 1-2 lo corpo ... Aldegisio] lo quale corpo *F, P2*, del quale lo suo corpo *SN2, P3* 2 Aldegisio] *om. SN1* || mandato] portato *N1* || alo] dal *PL, E* || Lombardia] et ivi fo sepellito *add. PL, E* 3 castella] *om. N1, P3, SN2*, altre terre *F, P2*, de fore cio è deli *add. GC* || CC] *C<sup>v</sup> V* || duy milia] *M<sup>c</sup> V, SN2, P3* || duy ... peduni] de i pedoni fuoron morti duo milia et cento *PL*, de pedoni duo millia et cento *E* || peduni] homini ad pedi *SN1* 4 morti] piu de *add. N1, P3* || morti ... milia] *M' V, X<sup>m</sup> P3, SN2, P3* 5 Et per questo] in tanto che *F, P2* 5-6 non ... ne] li remasi cavaliere i *PL* 5 nche (*P1*)] de *M1*, li *E* 6 ne] *om. V* 7 et che ... morti] *om. F, P2* || la maiore ... erano] ne erano tanti *N1, SN2, P3* || erano] destructi et *add. P1* 7-8 feceno chyamare] chiamareno *N1, SN2, P3* 8 citate] citadin *SN1* || citate et castella] terre *F, P2* || altre] *om. SN1* 9 per muglyere] *om. N1* || tanto] cosi *E* || citelle] *om. V, F, E, P2* 10 vedue] che erano *add. V* || remase ... cavaliere] di quegli ch'erano stati ucciesi ala bactaglia *PL, E* || morti] mariti *P2* 11 et divulgare] *om. F, P2, SN1* 11-12 per un trombecta ... trombecta] per diverse parti per uno tronbecta *F, N1, P2* 12 trombecta] et banditore *add. PL, E* || Aymone] duca e chiamavase Oldeo *add. PL*, duca et chiamase Ildeo *add. E* || e chyamata] *om. SN1* || breve] poco *P2* 13 multi] altri *add. SN1* || tanto ... quanto] cavaleri et *F, P2* || cio è] *om. PL, E, F, P2* 14 l'Acerra] Xerie *E* 14-15 ala quale ... homine] et vennerovi *F, P2* 14 fama] *om. P1, N1, SN2, P3*, e che niuna piu veloce vola *add. PL, E* 15 vi vennero] tra vennero *GC* || probi] *om. P1, N1, SN2, P3*, prodi *V* || da] ad *GC* 17 doctore] dottore *add. SN2, P3* || ancora] et auctore *E*, anche *F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 17-18 et Paulo ... amico] *om. F, P2* 18 suo] caro *add. PL, E, N1, SN1* || sufficiente] *om. E*, sufficientissimo *GC* || venendo] venne ancora *PL, E*, vende vi *V*, vennero *SN1* 18-238.3 venendo da Africa ... legenda] *om. F, P2* 18 Africa] ancora *add. SN1* || pontefece] principe *V* 19 poy] *om. E* || Sarno] Salerno *V*



quale confessore glorioso et patrone de la dicta cita de Napoli sempre visse in grande devocione et oracione secundo che declara in de la sua legenda. Ancora alcune altri gentili homine li quali per la gracia de Dio le loro naciune ancora durano et vivono nobelememente venendo ala dicta cita alcune da Scocia, alcune da Francza, et ancora de quilli che venuti 5 erano per difendere la dicta cita ne restireno assay. Et multi altri populani co.loro figlyoli et muglyere da diverse parte de lo mundo vennero in Napoli ad habitare con consentimento de la universitate. Et quilli li quali non aveano muglyere piglyavano le muglyeri et figliuoli de quilli che uccisi stati erano et nelle dicte bactaglye con tucti loro bene. Et cossi 10 se impliò de gente la cita de Napoli et in quillo medesimo tempo fo contaminato lo sangue napolitano et questo fo la seconda volta.

## 51 (53B)

*Because this victory occurred on Saint Paul's Day, the temple founded by Tiberius Julius Tarsus was converted into the church of San Paolo by Naples' 15 duke, Anthino. He also moved the stream by which the Saracen ships had approached Naples.*

Per la quale cosa, ad laude et gloria de lo omnipotente Dio et honore de lo apostolo et doctore sancto Paulo in de la festivitate de la quali li napolitane octennero duy victorie de li predicti sarracine, de quillo 20 templo hedificato da Tiberio Iulio Tarso si fecero una sollempne ecclesia. Sollempnemente celebravano la sua festa. In quillo tempo era una acqua

1 de Napoli] *om. PL, E* 2 grande] grandissima *GC* || et oracione] *om. V* || declara] fo declarato *V* 3 alcune] *om. N1, P3* 4 ancora] *om. E, anche N1, ancho SN2, P3* || durano] adorano *GC* || venendo] vennoro *PL, E, SN1*, vivono *V* 5 cita] de Napoli *GC* || alcune] et anche *F, P2* || Francza] Africa *N1, P3* || et] alcuni *GC* || ancora] anche *F, P2* 5-6 venuti erano] vennero *F, P2* 6 la dicta cita] Napoli *PL, E* || cita] de Napoli *add. P1, F, P2* || ne] et *SN1* 7-10 da diverse ... bene] vennero ad habitare *F, P2* 8 con ... de] constringendoli *E, cita et add. GC* 9 le muglyeri et figliuoli] per moglie le figliole *SN1* || et figliuoli (*PL*)] de li figlyoli *M1, GC, om. P1, N1, SN2, P3* 10 uccisi ... erano] erano morti *SN1* || stati] in Napoli *add. PL* || et nelle ... bene] *om. E* || tucti ... bene] loro bieni e possessioni *PL* 11 se impliò (*N1*)] impero *PL*, se inpiò *P1*, se inpiè *M1*, rempiò *V, SN1*, impirnò *E* || de gente ... Napoli] la cita *E* || la cita] de quella sanctissima cita *GC* || et] etando *PL*, et tandem *E* 11-12 in quillo ... volta] et questa fo la seconda volta che fo contaminato lo sangue napolitano *F, P2* 11 fo] *om. V* 12 fo] *om. P1*, ne *E* 13 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 18 ad laude ... gloria] *om. GC* || gloria] honore *P2* || Dio] *om. P1* || honore] ad gloria *P2* 19 apostolo] popolo *GC* 20 victorie] bactaglie *N1, SN2, P3* 21 templo] tempo *PL, E, GC, P3* || hedificato] hedificaro *GC* || ecclesia] et in quella ecclesia *add. PL, V, SN1*, et che in quella ecclesia *E*, dove *add. F, P2* 22 celebravano] se celebrasse *PL, E*, se potesse celebrare *F, P2* 22-239.4 In quillo tempo ... essendo] dopo delequale chuose *PL, E*

la quale era multo grossa et correa appresso la cita de Napoli inter lo monte de Sancto Heramo et lo monte de Patrusculo et venia per meczo lo Gualdo. Per la quale acqua o viro fyume intravano le nave de sarracine et veniano colloro navilii per fine propinqui ad Napoli. Onde essendo ordinato Anthino consulo et duca de la cita de Napoli, lu quale fece la  
 5 predicta ecclesia de Sancto Paulo nelo dicto templo, habe consiglyo cola universitate de Napoli et ordinaro et fecero andare per altra via la predicta fyumara o viro grosso curso de acqua. Anche habe uno altro opinione, cio è che data li fosse via socto terra alo mare. Per l'una via o per l'altra la  
 10 predicta acqua ogi non vi è.

## 52 (54B)

*In 835 Saint Athanasius headed the church of Naples. He advised the nuns who had moved to the island at Saint Patrizia's request that they must elect an abbot, and gave them the church of Santa Lucia within the church of  
 15 San Giovanni, with all its wealth. He also created the monastery at San Gennaro fuori le mura, which then had only one priest, and appointed its abbot.*

Nel tempo de lo dicto papa Andriano nellanni de lo Signyore C<sup>viii</sup> XXXV, essendo nella ecclesia de Napoli sancto Acthenaso, lu quale inter l'altri sancti per le vertute de le quale era plino per diversi modi, era visitatore  
 20 de li suoy subiecti et ricordavali et ammonivali ale bone operacione.

---

1 appresso] verso P<sub>2</sub> || inter] et SN<sub>1</sub> 2 Heramo] Hermano V || et lo ... Patrusculo] om. GC || de] sancto add. V 3 Gualdo] Gaudio V || per] om. V || nave] suste SN<sub>1</sub> || de sarracine] de P<sub>1</sub>, dallà F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 5 Anthino] anche V || fece] om. V 6 de Sancto Paulo] om. PL, E || templo] tempo P<sub>2</sub> 6-7 cola universitate] col popolo PL, E 7 de Napoli] om. GC || et ordinaro] ordinato V || ordinaro et] om. PL, E || altra (P<sub>1</sub>)] alta M<sub>1</sub>, la loro V 7-10 la predicta fyumara ... è] un'acqua grande et fyume davi [= dove E] poterono navigare navilii. La qual correva appresso la cita di Napoli inter lo monte di Santo Heramo e'l monte di Patrustulo [= Patruzo E] et per [per om. E] mezo il Guado per la quale acqua et fyume si intraro i navilii di sarrayni add. PL, E 8 o viro ... acqua] om. SN<sub>1</sub> || grosso] om. F, P<sub>2</sub> || de acqua] om. GC || habe] vi V, se tene F, P<sub>2</sub>, cioè SN<sub>1</sub> 9 cio è] et V 9-10 Per ... predicta] la quale F, P<sub>2</sub> 10 è] seu appare add. P<sub>1</sub>, ne appare F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, vene SN<sub>1</sub>, piu add. V 11 cap 51 (53B) et 52 (54B) uniti E, tit. add. N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 18 Nel] Per lo GC || de lo signyore] Ihu x<sup>o</sup> add. P<sub>1</sub>, V, domini PL, de xpo N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, delo nostro singiore Yhu xpo F, P<sub>2</sub>, GC, del nostro signore SN<sub>1</sub> || C<sup>viii</sup> XXXV] C<sup>vii</sup> XXXV E, C<sup>viii</sup> XXXII V, C<sup>viii</sup> XXXV P<sub>2</sub>, CCCCCC XXXXV GC 19 ecclesia] cita N<sub>1</sub> 20 per le] om. PL, E, et delle SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || per ... quale] et virtute F, de virtute P<sub>2</sub> 21 ricordavali] ordinavali V || ammonivali] ad moniali P<sub>1</sub>

Et inpercio li visitava et co una frequente ammonicione consiglyava ad  
 quelle monache o viro calore permutate da lo monasterio de Sancta  
 Patricia alo scoglyo dove è lo Castello dell'Ovo ad instancia de la predicta  
 sancta Patricia como è dicto de sopra, li quali stavano in quella insula  
 sencza governatore che devessero elegere una de ipse in abbate lo quale 5  
 li governasse como ad bono pastore in de la subieccione et discrezione  
 regolare ale quale lo dicto sancto Acthanaso concesse graciousamente la  
 ecclesia de Sancta Lucia vergene che sta dentro la ecclesia de Sancto  
 Johanne Maiure la quale era ricchissima et de multe rendite copiosa et  
 concesse in perpetuum con tucte le ragiune soy, la quali ecclesia avea certe 10  
 ragione ala marina de Napoli. Et inpercio che è facta noticia de lo predicto  
 sancto Acthenaso delle quale soy operatione bone non è da tacere che  
 in de la ecclesia de Sancto Ianuario foro le mura de Napoli li stava  
 solamente uno preyte alo servizio de Dio et sancto Actenaso constituyo  
 et fece lo monasterio socto la gubernacione de lo abbate et in quillo 15  
 luoco ordinò ipso uno homo de religiosa et singulare vita in abbate alo

---

1 Et inpercio ... ammonicione] *om.* SN1 1-3 Et inpercio ... dell'Ovo] et exendo visitato da le monache de Santa Patricia da lui erano ammonite et ammagistrate sempre [sempre *om.* P2] in tucte bone opere, da lo quale Actenasio li fo concesso che F, P2 1 li] spisso PL, E || frequente] *om.* E 2 o viro] et E || o viro calore] *om.* V, SN1, o vero ca loro erano GC || da] cha V 3 Patricia] era *add.* V 3-4 alo scoglyo ... Patricia] *om.* GC 3 lo scoglyo ... è] *om.* PL, E || scoglyo] consiglio P3 3-4 ad ... Patricia] *om.* PL, E 4 como ... quali] la quale è innanti dicta che come le dicte monache F, inanti dicta che como le donne monache P2 || insula] libere et *add.* PL, et *add.* E 5 devessero] havessero V || de ipse in abbate] de P1, *om.* F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || abbate] abatesse V, SN1 6 et discrecione (P1)] et discripcione M1, *om.* F, P2, et gubernacione GC 7 regolare] de regere V || Acthanaso] per loro cotidiane spese *add.* PL, Anastasio per loro chondura spese E || graciousamente] *om.* F, P2 8 vergene] et martira *add.* PL, E, *om.* GC || sta] stava PL, E, N1 || la ecclesia] *repet.* M1 9 era] è P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || ricchissima] vechissima V, ecclesia *add.* F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || et] ecclesia P1 || copiosa] copiosamente GC 10 ragiune] et pertinensie *add.* PL, E 10-11 soy ... ragione] *om.* SN2, P3 10 avea] ave F, N1, P2 10-11 avea ... ragione] *om.* V 11 Napoli] le quale ragioni sue ce have *add.* SN2, P3 11-12 Et inpercio ... bone] dil quale sancto Acthenaso PL, E || Et inpercio ... tacere che] pero non è da tacere de et non dire alcune cose delo predicto santo Actenasio dele soe bone operationi F, *item sed om.* "dele soe bone operationi" P2 12 operatione] opere SN2, P3 || bone ... da] non è bene ad SN1 || che] *om.* P1, N1, SN2, P3 13-15 in de la ecclesia ... abbate] *om.* P2 13 de Sancto] *repet.* N1 || Ianuario] martire *add.* E 14 solamente] *om.* GC || sancto] Iennaro oviro *add.* V || Actenaso] con statuti *add.* V 14-15 constituyo et] vi PL, E, et F, quistuni SN1 15 monasterio] magisterio GC || abbate] abbatia GC 16 ipso] sancto Athenasio *add.* P2, *om.* GC || de ... vita] religioso vita et singulare V || religiosa] gloriosa P2, una sancta religiosa vita GC || singulare] santa SN2, P3 || alo] el P2 16-241.2 alo quale ... collegio] primo li soi collegii GC

quale primo dede collegio de monaci ad cio che continuamente luy colo suo collegio servesse a Dio orando.

## 53 (55B)

*In the time of Pope John XII the Saracens beseiged Naples. Lacking any human aid, the Neapolitans prayed to their patron saints Januarius and Agrippinus. The saints caused the largest Saracen ship to sink, and the other ships fled.* 5

Legese che nelo tempo de papa Johanne duodecimo et dello inperatore che era in Costantinopoli venendono li sarracine da Africa assediario la cita de Napoli. In delo quale tempo la dicta cita non poteva avere succurso humano ne remedio. Et inpercio ala religione et ali sollempni patrune loro se voltaro cio è ad sancto Januario et ad sancto Arpino li quali foro de Napoli de la piazza de Forcella consueti de fare [grandissimi miraculi. Li quali con] grandissime lacrime et suspire incomenzaro ad pregare che como ipsi co.lloro meriti et pregarie liberaro la dicta cita de lo fuoco de lo monte de Visiovio, cossi le debiano dare agiuto contra a lo forore de la gente infedele. Li predicti sancti beati martire et viscopi si apparsero la nocte ad uno stagio pregione in quillo tempo affligentose per Napoli, et dimandarelo per che ipso spandeva tante lacrime et per che tanto se doleva. Et illo resposse che cray per tempo serra presa la cita de Napoli et serrande una grande effusione de sangue. Li predicti sancti martire si lo consularo et dissero: non placza a Dio che è tanto misericordiuso et ala sua grande potencia che si grande peccato et male se promecta. Finita la nocte et sopravnenodo l'aurora, li sarracine co.lloro nave se appressemaro 10 15 20

---

1 continuamente] costantemente V 1-2 lo suo] li suoi monaci et E 2 orando] om. PL, E, et sanctificando la sua beatissima vita et sanctesema add. GC 3 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 8 Legese] Scrivese et legiese PL, E || duodecimo] in Roma add. PL, E 9 che era] om. PL, E || venendono] vedendo P2, vennero SN1 10 tempo] om. P1, assedio F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 12 voltaro] ricommandaro F, P2, voleano GC || li quali foro (P1)] ali quali foro M1, GC, il quale fo PL 13 Napoli] li quali foro add. P1, et foro add. F, P2, SN2, P3 13-14 grandissimi ... con (SN1)] om. M1, P1, F, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3 14 ad] fare a add. GC 15 como] con P3 || et pregarie] om. V 16 lo monte] la morte V || Visiovio] viscopo GC || debiano dare] daghino E, degiano dare omne GC 17 beati] om. E, V, N1, SN1, GC, SN2, P3 || martire et viscopi] confexori et martiri V, martiri N1, SN2, P3 18 affligentose] affingendo GC 20 Et illo resposse] om. P2 || cray] domani F, P2 || la cita de] om. N1, SN2, P3 || de Napoli] om. V 21 martire] om. SN1 22 consularo] consigliaro V 23 che si grande] che è si grande che grande P2 || peccato] pacto GC || et] si gran add. V || se promecta] et che pernecta V 24 sarracine] nemici PL, E || nave] navilii PL, E || appressemaro] appressaro P1, N1, SN2, P3, appresentaro V

ala cita per la fyumara sopradicta da lo canto de la Porta de Dompno Urso con castellame de lignyame in meczo delle nave che quasi la proda era equale ala mura de la terra et poste le scale ale mura como stavano alo saglyre per li meriti de li dicti sancti martiri la pyu gran nave che illi habero s'anegò et per questo tucto lo exercito fo torbato, et inpauriti si 5 ritornaro adietro.

## 54 (56B)

*In the time of the emperor Lothar, the Neapolitans, fighting the Saracens, recited a prayer to God that caused all the Saracens to drown.*

Legese che in tempo de Lactario inperatore de li romani fratello de Carlo 10 et de Ludovico, comactendo in mari li napolitani contra li sarracine, essendo in Roma papa Gregorio quarto de nazione romana, si fece questa oracione: Idio che lo beato Pietro apostolo andante per la tempesta de lo mare sostenne che non annegasse, et sancto Paulo apostolo una con Pietro li quali annegava lo sequente di liberò, exauditi tu benigno la 15 nostra pregaria et concedene per li meriti de tucti dui nui poczamo sequire le beatitudine et eterna gloria. Et per vertu de la dicta oracione li sarracine subito annegaro in mare.

---

1-2 ala cita ... lignyame] et allasati cierti castellame *PL*, et alzati certi castellani *E* || Dompno Urso] Urso *P1*, *F*, *N1*, *P*, *SN2*, *P3* 2 in meczo] *om. E*, incomenczò *SN1* 2-3 proda era (*N1*)] proda erano *PL*, *M1*, *SN1*, preda erano *P1*, le proe erano *E*, parola oviro la proda erano *V*, predicta erano *GC* 3 de la terra ... mura] *om. E*, *SN1* || terra] cita *N1*, *SN2*, *P3* 3-4 et poste ... saglyre] apparecchiati con scale per montare su le mura et stando apparicchiati per montare su le mura ma *F*, *P2* 3 poste le] *om. P1*, *N1*, apparecchiate le *SN2*, *P3* || ale mura (*P2*)] habe misericordia *P1*, *M1*, *GC*, abero misericordia *N1*, misericordia Dio *SN2*, *P3* 3-4 stavano alo (*P1*)] stavano alo alo *M1*, se credevano di *PL*, *E*, stavano apparecchiati alo *N1*, *SN2*, *P3* 4 martiri] *om. SN1* 4-5 che illi habero] *om. PL*, *E* 5 s'anegò] se affondò *SN2*, *P3* || per questo] chosi *PL*, *E* || fo torbato] se turbò *P2* 5-6 inpauriti si ritornaro] ricostosse *PL*, reculosse *E* 5 si] tucti *F*, *P2* 7 *tit. add. N1*, *SN2*, *P3* 10 Legese] anche *add. PL*, *E* || inperatore] primo *add. PL*, *E* 11 mari] mano *E* 12 Gregorio] Lione *PL*, *E* || de ... romana] *om. PL*, *E* 13 Idio (*PL*)] a Dio *M1*, *P1*, *F*, *V*, *N1*, *P2*, *SN1*, *GC*, *SN2*, *P3* || andante] andare *E* 14 annegasse] annegare potesse *N1* 15 exauditi] exaudice *F*, exaudi *P2*, exaudisce *SN2*, *P3* || exauditi tu benigno] exaudio *SN1* || tu] signor *add. SN2*, *P3* 16 et concedene] con dulcedine *V*, et concedemi *E*, *GC*, *SN2*, *P3* || tucti dui nui] lo nostri pregheri *GC* || dui nui (*N1*)] nuy duy *M1*, *P1*, duo *PL*, *E*, *V*, *SN1*, *SN2*, *P3* || poczamo] possano *SN1*, *GC* 17 eterna] summa *V* || gloria] amen *add. E* || per] *om. GC* 18 subito] *om. P1*, tucti *F*, *N1*, *P2*, *SN2*, *P3*

## 55 (57B)

*The Neapolitans began to attack Sipanto, whose people, advised by Pope Gregory, asked for a short truce and prayed to Saint Michael. On the day of battle Mount Gargano seemed to move and lightning covered it, whence the Neapolitans retreated and were pursued and captured.* 5

Como li napolitani volse destrugere Sipanto.

Narrase anche che li napolitani tentareno de volereno distrugere per forca de arme quilli de Sipanto. Unde quilli de Sipanto si forono consigliati da lo dicto papa Gregorio che dimandasseno spacio de tempo et fo alloro concesso. Inter lo quale spacio si voltaro in iegiuunii et oracione 10 et pregaro sancto Michael archangelo che illo liberasse da tante angustie. Al quarto di lo archangelo Michael si ammoniò quilli de Sipanto che andare devessero contra a. lloro inimici. Et indelo principio de la bactaglya apparse che lo monte Gargano se movesse et pareo che multi fulgore volassero et grande oscurita coperse lo monte. Li napolitani per quisti 15 signi si voltaro indereto, et alcune feriti foro da li inimici da lo folgere lu quale dessese da lo celo, et per questo forono sequitati et caczati.

## 56 (58B)

*(List of the lords of the various cities and regions of southern Italy before it was unified by the Normans.)* 20

Qui se narra in che forma stava lo riame de Cicilia innante che fosse intitulado riame.

---

6 *tit. om. PL, P1, F, E, P2, SN1*, Como miracolosamente foro sconfitti li napolitani di quelli di Simpatò *N1, SN2, P3* 7 Narrase ... volereno] Avendo volonta ly napolitani *F, P2* || anche] anchora *SN2, P3* || anche che] che uno di *V* 8–9 Unde ... consigliati] sci foreno consigliati li cittadini de Sipanto *F*, si foreno consegnati *N, om. P2*, dove essendo consigliati *SN2, P3* 9 Gregorio] Lione *PL, E* || dimandasseno] a Dio *add. F* 10 concesso] che *add. P1, M1, GC* || si voltaro ... oracione] con multa contritione orationi et iegiuunii se ricommandaro a Dio *F, P2* || voltaro] vacaro *PL, E*, votaro *V, GC* || in (*P1*)] *om. M1, GC* || iegiuunii et] gemito et *E*, ginochione in *V*, digiuunii et *SN2, P3* 11 archangelo] per tre di *add. PL, E* || illo] li *F, P2, SN2, P3*, li rivelasse et *add. GC* 12 archangelo] angelo *P1* 13 andare devessero] andassero *GC* || de] che se comenzò *F, P2* 14 lo] nel *SN1* 15 coperse] tucto *add. P1, PL, F, V, N1, P2, E, SN1, GC, SN2, P3* || monte] mundo *GC* || Li] dove erano *SN2, P3* 16 alcune] multi *F, P2* || foro] *om. PL* || inimici] alchuni *add. PL, E* || folgere] fuogho *PL, E* 17 et ... questo] *om. PL*, et *E*, li napolitani *add. F, P2, SN2, P3* || sequitati] persequitati *PL, V, P2, E, P3* 21 Qui] Como *GC* 21–22 Qui ... riame] *tit. om. P1, PL, F, P2, E, SN1*, Como nelo regno era prima multi signuri nanti che lo riame fosse sotto re *N1*, Come nello regno erano prima multi et multi signuri innanti che lo riame fosse sotto reale *SN2, P3* 21 Cicilia] che *add. V*

Poy de questo è da sapere che lo riame de Cicilia, primo che fosse unito o de tucto facto uno et intitulado riame, erano diversi dominii et signyuri. Et primo lo inperatore Costantino era signyore de la cita de Napoli. In Terra de Lavore era lo principe de Capua alo quale li era subiecto lo conte [de Caserta, lo conte] de Fundi. Erance lo signyore de Cuma, de Piczulo et de Baya; era lo duca de Benevento, erance lo principe de Salerno et lo duca de Amalfi, erance lo signyore de la cita de Sorrento et de lo suo districto. Erance lo duca de Puglia incomenzando da Troya. Erance lo principe de Bare, lo signyore de lo honore de lo Monte de Sancto Angelo et de Salpe. In Terra de Otranto era lo principe de Taranto. In Calabria era lo duca de Calabria. In Abruczo citra et ultra erano diversi signyure, cio è lo conte d'Albi et lo conte de Menuppello et lo conte de Sanguino, et lo conte de Lorito, et lo conte de Cilano et lo conte dell'Aquila. In de lo contato de Molise era lo conte de Molisi. La insula de Cicilia alcuna volta fo subiecto alo inperatore de Roma, alcuna volta alo re de Africa. De poy la venuta de Roberto Viscardo de tucta la predicta insula fo facto uno contato et per la industria de lo dicto Roberto, Rogiere suo fratello fo intitulado conte de Cicilia.

## 57 (59B)

*Robert Guiscard came to southern Italy with his eleven brothers to fight for the prince of Capua. He soon made himself lord of the whole region except for Naples, and appointed his brother Roger count of Sicily.*

Como Roberto Viscardo acquistò lo riame de Cicilia per se et como intitulò lo fratello conte de la insula de Cicilia.

---

1 unito] tucto unito *F, P2*, venuto *GC* 2 o de ... uno] *om. V* || intitulado] in del dicto *add. PL, E* 3 Costantino] de Constantinopoli *SN1* || Costantino era] è *E* 5 de ... conte (*P1*)] *om. M1* || lo signyore] *om. N1* 6 Salerno] et de suo districto *add. GC* 6-7 et ... Amalfi] et lo prencepe de Salerno *F, om. P2* 7 la cita de] *om. E, GC* || suo] forte *add. P1* 8 incomenzando da Troya] *om. PL, E* 9 principe] duca *V* || de lo honore] de livore *E, om. V* || de lo Monte] de lo mundo *P1, om. N1, SN2, P3* 10 In Terra] Intra de *SN1* || era ... Taranto] *om. N1* 11 era Calabria] *repet. P1* || signyure] conti *PL, E* 12 et lo conte de Sanguino] *om. PL, E* 13 et lo conte dell'Aquila] *om. PL, E* 14 era lo conte de Molisi] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3* 15 volta] fiata *V, om. GC* || alcuna volta] alcuna fiata 16 de] re *add. GC* || predicta] provincia seu *GC* 17 dicto] re *add. GC* || Rogiere] regnò *V* 18 fo intitulado] *om. N1* || 19 *ivi usque ad finem narratio est unica V: in "Appendix I"* 23-24 Como ... Cicilia] Como Roberto Viscardo venne nelo regno co undici soi fratelli chiamato da Pandolfo prencepe de Capua et poi acquistò lo regno per ipso *N1, item sed om.* "poi" et "per ipso" *SN2, P3, tit. om. PL, P1, F, P2, E, SN1* || per se ... Cicilia] *om. P3* || et ... Cicilia] *om. N1*

Roberto Viscardo venne alo riame co undece soy fratelli, homine tucti  
 acti ad bactaglya, lo quale chymato fo da Pandulfo principe de Capua  
 lo quale guerreggiava colo principe de Salerno. Unde Roberto per la sua  
 virtu dell'arme in anno domini M LV fo facto conducetore et capo de  
 tucti li normandi et d'altri frostiere che guerriggiavano nelo riame. Et  
 conossendo illo lo grande sequito et potencia che illo avea, la venne uno  
 ardente desiderio de acquistare per se lo riame. Et fecelo inpercio che in  
 successione de poco tempo per le soy vertute et sapere tenne si facti modi  
 et ordinò che rimoti da.lloro dominii tucti li signyure et principi de lo  
 riame excepto lo principe de Salerno lu quale alluy era cognato inpercio  
 che lo dicto Roberto piglyata avea per muglyere madamma Sengregayta  
 sorella de lo dicto principe. Et da poy facto et intitulado duca de Puglya  
 et de Calabria per papa Nicola secundo de la nazione de Bercundie. Lu  
 quale Roberto di poy soccese alo principato de Salerno per la morte de  
 lo dicto suo caynato che herede niuna habbe altro che la sorella. Et da  
 poy per comandamento de la ecclesia tucto lo riame subiugò excepto la  
 nobile cita de Napoli la quale non pocte may subiugare per lo grande  
 valore de li citadini liquali verilemente resistero. Fece lo dicto Roberto  
 conte de Cicilia Rogiere suo fratello et visse lo dicto Roberto in dominio  
 anni XXVII del ducato de Puglya et de Calabria.

## 58 (60B)

*Robert and his brothers and successors were good Christians and founded many churches and cities in southern Italy.*

1 venne] unde *P1* || homine] *om. F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3* || tucti] *om. PL, E* 2 lo quale ... da] chiamate da Lodovico figliuolo di *PL, E* 3 guerreggiava] aregnava *N1* || Unde] Il quale *PL, E* 4 domini] de xpo *F, P2* || M LV] *om. cum 995* ovvero 1055 *add. super lineam SN1* || conducetore] doctore *PL, E* || et (*P1*)] de *M1* 5 li normandi] la Normandia *P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || guerriggiavano nelo] vi regnavano lo *N1*, ci regnavano nel *P2* 6 et potencia] *om. E* 7 inpercio che] *om. E* 8-9 sapere ... et] acti extrenoy per tal modo *PL, E* 9 ordinò] ordini *P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 9-10 de lo riame] *om. PL, E* 11 lo ... Roberto] *om. PL, E* 12 sorella ... principe] soa sorella *PL, E* || et intitulado] chole bandiere *add. PL, E* 13 papa ... Bercundie] lu papa *PL, E* || Bercundie] Bertudine *SN2, P3* || Lu] Alo *F, P2, SN1* 14 di poy] *om. PL, E, GC* || soccese] soccorse *E* || alo (*P1*)] lo *PL, M1, F, V, P2, E, SN1, GC, SN2, P3* 15 che herede ... sorella] per parte de la sore *PL, E* || herede] che *add. N1* || altro] *om. N1* || sorella] roserella *GC* 17 cita de] de *P1, om. F* || grande] *om. PL, E* 19 conte] indila insola *add. PL, E* || lo ... Roberto] *om. PL, E*, lo dicto Rogier *SN1, GC* || in dominio] *om. SN1* 20 XXVII] XXIII *E* || del ... Calabria] *om. PL, E* || ducato (*P1*)] ducato *M1* 21 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3*



Quisto Roberto et suoy frati et successure forono captolici xpiani et fecero hedificare multe ecclesie in de lo predicto riame lequale grandemente dotò. Et primo hedificò la ecclesia de Sancto Maczeo de Salerno, la ecclesia de Trinitate de Venosa, lo viscopato de Averse, et anche hedificò la cita de Averse la quale primo era castello et non cita. Anche fecero hedificare la cita de Melfi colo castello et la matre ecclesia sua. Le predicte ecclesie per loro hedificate et de multe terre et castella et altre rendita le dotaro.

## 59 (61B)

*After waging military campaigns in Byzantium and Bulgaria, Robert answered the pope's call to free Rome from the seige of Emperor Henry IV. He then led the pope safely to Benevento, and died on his way back to Bulgaria.*

Poy de questo lo dicto Roberto con grande quantitate de cavaliere fecero passaggio in Romania dove acquistò Duraczo et Costantinopoli, in de le quale parte fece grande facti de arme colo imperatore, vinto con grande uccisione de gente. De poy lo predicto Roberto si passò in Vulgaria et tenne assediato lo imperatore de Vulgaria strectamente per campo ordinato. In de lo quale luoco stando Roberto, per una sollempne inbassiatia fo chyamato da papa Gregorio, loquale assediato era da la inperatore Herrico de Suavia et da lo populo de Roma alo castello de Sancto Angelo sopra lo Tevare, che li placesse de lo seccorrere ad questa greve necessita inpercio che da poy de Dio, da niuno homo aspectava adiuto se no de ipso. Alo quale papa la speranza de Roberto non venne meno. Per

2-3 lequale ... dotò] *om.* SN1 3 dotò] doctò N1, indotò GC || hedificò] *om.* PL, E 4 ecclesia de] *om.* PL, E, sancta *add.* GC || Averse] il monasterio di San Lorenzo di Aversa *add.* PL 4-5 et anche ... Averse] *om.* F, N1, P2, E, SN2, P3 5 et non cita] di Napoli PL, E, et lui la edificò in cita *add.* N1, SN2, P3, *om.* SN1 5-6 Anche ... hedificare] Hedificaro PL, Hedificò E 6 colo] et fece lo GC 7 per ... hedificate] *om.* PL, E || et altre ... le] *om.* P2 || altre] multe GC 7-8 le dotaro] et anche fece edificare lo venerabile monasterio de Sancto Laurenczo d'Aversa *add.* SN1, indotaro GC 9 *tit. add.* N1, SN2, P3 14 passaggio (P1)] passio M1 14-15 in ... parte] dove PL, E 15 facti] parte P1 || imperatore] di Gostantinopoli il quale imperadore *add.* PL, di Constantinopoli *add.* E || vinto (P1)] unito M1, *om.* E, et vincillo P2, venito GC, et vintolo F, SN2, P3 16 de poy] *om.* PL, E || Vulgaria] Ungaria SN2, P3 17 assediato] ad exedio P2 || de Vulgaria] in Vulgaria F, N1, *om.* P2, in Ungaria SN2, P3 17-18 per ... ordinato] in campo et ordino GC 18 Roberto] in campo *add.* PL, E 19-20 Herrico] Federico Barbarusso SN1 21 Tevare] de Roma *add.* P1, F, de Rome mandandoli dicendo *add.* N1, SN2, P3 21-22 che ... necessita] *om.* E 21 lo seccorrere] darli succurso SN1 || questa greve] la sua grande P2 22 da poy] *om.* E || homo] *om.* E 23 speranza] resposto SN1 23-247.1 Per ... cosa] impero che PL, E

la quale cosa lo predicto Roberto se.ndè tornato verso Puglya, li lassò Boamundo suo figlyolo primogenito cola maiure parte de lo suo exercito alo predicto assedio de lo imperatore de Vulgaria. Et luy essendo iunto in Puglya, congregò grande exercito de cavaliere et pedune et subito se.nde andò ad Roma et si posse in fuga lo inperatore Herrico et socto-  
 5 posse lo populo romano, da poy la distrucione et castigatione de multi, ala signyoria de lo papa. Et di poy per un certo spacio de tempo, produsse lo papa con securo camino per da fine ad Benevento. Lu quale Roberto volendose tornare in Vulgaria dove lassato avea suo figlyolo colo suo exercito alo facto de la milicia contra lo imperatore de Vulgaria, si fo  
 10 morto de morte naturale in uno luoco lu quale è chymato Casopoli o viro Casola nella sua etate anni LX in anno domini M LXXXII.

## 60 (62B)

*After Robert's successors Roger and William, his lands passed to Roger, the son of Count Roger of Sicily, who had himself crowned king of Sicily. The  
 15 pope attacked him for his presumption, but beaten in battle, he came to an agreement and invested Roger as king. [B: Naples now joined the kingdom. Roger spent two years there and created many Neapolitan knights, then left for Palermo and ruled 24 years.]*

Morto finalmente lo dicto Roberto, si succese alo dominio et ala signyoria de soy terre Rogiere, de poy la morte de Boamundo primogenito lo quale finiò li iorni suoy armiczando in de le parte de Vulgaria. Lo quale Rogiere visse in de lo dominio anni XXV et mise sey. Et in de li anni de la sua etate L fo morto ad Salerno et sepellito ala maiure ecclesia de

1 Roberto] re GC || se.ndè tornato] chon cieti caporali se.nde venne e tornòse.nde PL, E, venne et tornato F, N1, P2, SN2, se ne venne et tornato SN1, venne P3 || li] alo assedio N1, SN2, P3 || li lassò] om. GC 2-3 lo ... exercito] la gente PL, E 3 alo ... assedio] om. P2 || assedio] exercito F || Vulgaria] Ungaria SN2, P3 4 iunto] om. PL, E, arrivato F, P2 || congregò] con SN1 || exercito de] gente add. F, P2 || pedune] fanti appiedi SN1 5 Herrico] Federico SN1 6 da poy ... multi] destrugendo et castigandonde multi et soctomectendoli F, P2 7 certo] om. GC 7-8 produsse ... papa] condussilo GC 9 Roberto] re GC || Vulgaria] Ungaria SN2, P3 9-10 colo ... exercito] om. PL, E 10 alo facto ... Vulgaria] om. F, P2 || contra] de SN1, GC || de Vulgaria] om. SN1, de Ungaria SN2, P3 11 è chymato] se chiama PL, E 12 nella ... etate] d' E || LX] XL P2 13 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 20 finalmente] om. F, P2 || Roberto] re GC 20-21 et ala signyoria] om. PL || et ala ... terre] suo E 21 Rogiere] suo secundogenito add. SN1 22 Vulgaria] Ungaria SN2, P3 22-23 Lo ... Rogiere] e PL, E 23 lo dominio] li GC 23-24 Et in ... morto] et poi si morìò SN2, P3 24 etate] anni add. E || L fo] om. N1 || fo morto] et morìò add. F, P2 || maiure] matre N1, SN2, P3 24-248.1 de Salerno] om. F, P2, SN1

Salerno la quale lo patre hedificare facta avea. Alo dicto Rogiere succese  
 alo dominio Guilielmo suo figlyolo lu quale fo homo iusto et visse alo  
 dominio de lo ducato de Puglya et de Calabria anni XVIII et morto fo  
 senza figlyoli in de la cita de Salerno ali anni XXX de la sua etate et  
 sepellito fo ala matre ecclesia de Salerno in anno domini M C XXV. Et 5  
 inpercio che lo duca Guilielmo passao de questa vita senza herede se  
 fece herede de Rogiere conte de Cicilia figlyolo dell'altro Rogiere conte  
 de Cicilia et fratello de Roberto Viscardo. Lu quale Rogiere herede de lo  
 dicto Guilielmo succese in tucto lo dominio de le soy terre. In successione  
 de poco tempo se fece incoronare re de Cicilia, de la quale cosa fo multo 10  
 torbato papa Anecleto con tucto lo collegio de li suoy cardinali inpercio  
 che senza loro consienciam avea presumuto de prendere [la corona. Per  
 la quale cosa] lo papa gregò grande exercito de romani et campanini et  
 venne contra alo riame et primo per forza d'arme habe la cita de Sancto  
 Germano con tucti le castella de la abbatia. De che Rogiero, posto in fuga, 15  
 si ritornò indereto et lo papa sequitandolo l'assediò alo castello de Gal-  
 luczo. Lo quale Rogiero fo succurso per lo duca de Puglya suo figlyolo lu  
 quale habe nomo duca Guilielmo, lo quale mosso per carita et de amore  
 filiale con grande exercito venne et fo honorevelemente receputo per lo  
 bono regimento de suoy antecessure. 20

- A Et desiderando liberare lo patre da      Et disiderando liberare il padre da **B**  
 quil assedio, et conbactiò colo papa et      quel stricto assedio hordinò le schiere  
 sconfisselo et prese ipso et li cardinali      et fe una aspressima bactaglia chogli  
 con grande parte de lo exercito suo, et      exercito dil papa. Et finalmente chon  
 da poy vennero ad concordia colo pre-      gran occisione di la gente dil papa, 25  
 dicto papa. Et convestiò lo re Rogiere      Guiglielmo fo vinciedore e pigliò il

1 Alo dicto] poi salo dicto *F*, poi al dicto *P2*, poy *N1*, *SN2*, *P3* 2 Guilielmo ... alo] *om.*  
*GC* 3 de lo (*N1*)] che lo *M1*, *P1* || XVIII] XIII *E*, XVII *N1* 4 la cita de] *om.* *PL*, *E* ||  
 de la ... etate] *om.* *PL*, *E* 5 matre] dicta *PL*, *E* || de Salerno] de Galerno *N1*, *om.* *SN1* ||  
 domini] del signore *E* 6 duca] dicto *SN1* 7-8 figlyolo ... et] *om.* *E* || conte ...  
 Cicilia] *om.* *GC* 10 poco] poi *P1*, *om.* *E*, poy poco *N1*, *SN2*, *P3* || multo] morto *GC*  
 11 Anecleto] *repet.* *GC* 12 loro consienciam] loro consentimento *E*, soa licentia *F*, *P2*  
 12-13 la ... cosa (*F*)] *om.* *M1* 13 quale (*N1*)] *om.* *P1* || gregò] tucto lo *add.* *GC* ||  
 romani et campanini] gente romani et capuani *F*, *P2* || campanini (*SN1*)] capuani *P1*,  
*N1*, campiune *M1*, campane *GC* 14 primo] *om.* *PL*, *E* || habe] prese *F*, *P2* || [la cita de]  
*om.* *P1*, *F*, *N1*, *P2*, *SN2*, *P3* 14-15 Sancto Germano] Sarcimano *E* 15 tucti ... castella]  
 le terre *PL*, *E* 16 si ritornò] se ciessò *PL*, si se tirò *E*, subito se.nde tornò *F*, *P2* ||  
 et (*P1*)] a *M1* || sequitandolo] *om.* *PL*, *F*, *E*, *P2* 17 Rogiero] re *E* 17-18 lu ... nomo] e  
 chiamòse *PL*, *E* 18 habe ... duca] se chiamò ducha *F*, se chiamò *P2* || duca] *om.* *GC* ||  
 lo quale] lo dicto Guliermo *N1*, *SN2*, *P3*, *om.* *F*, *P2* 19 grande] amore et *add.* *SN2*, *P3*

A 23 ipso] tempo *SN1* || et li] con tucti li suoi *F*, *P2* 24 parte] *om.* *GC* 26 convestiò]  
 conveciò *N1*, investiò *SN1*, questo *GC*

A per la bandera de lo regno de Cicilia. Lo quale re Rogiere visse in dominio de lo regno de Cicilia anni XXIII et da poy moriò in Palermo et fo sepellito indela maiure ecclesia in de lo anno de la etate soa LVIII.

papa chon tucto'l collegio di cardina- B  
 nali et una gran parte di buon romani.  
 Et infra brieve tempo chol dicto Gui-  
 glielmo fo hordinata la liberacion dil  
 papa et di tucti gli altri. Et infra loro 5  
 fo tractata concordia che'l papa per  
 soa bolla et bandiere coronasse il dicto  
 Rogieri re di Scicilia et chosi fo facto.  
 In questo tempo la cita di Napoli se  
 uniò chol ryame et questa fo la prima 10  
 volta che Napoli fo sobcto il dominio  
 dil re che primo era socto il dominio  
 di g'l'imperadore de Gostantinopoli. Il  
 quale re Rogieri una chol papa ven- 15  
 nero ala cita di Napoli e foro pigliati  
 da tucti i citadini chon gran allegrezza  
 et festa. Et a quella intrata si fe il  
 dicto re Rogieri di la cita di Napoli CL  
 cavalieri et molto gli honorò di gran 20  
 duoni et per duo mesi continuamente  
 fo facta i.Napoli grandissima festa et  
 stecte fermo i.Napoli duo anni. Dopo  
 se partì per mare et andòse.nde im  
 Palermo et vixe in di la soa felicità 25  
 anni XXIII. Et fo morto im Palermo  
 nell'anni di la soa eta LVIII et fo sepel-  
 lito nella magiore ecclesia di Palermo  
 all'anni domini MC XLVIII.

61

63

*(Physical and character portrait of Roger II, and his construction of many churches, 30  
 palaces, and gardens.)*

Fo lo re Rogiere homo de grande sta-  
 tura, corpolento, la facze habe lion-  
 nina et la voce subrauca. Et fo savro,  
 provido, et discreto et virtuoso et  
 multo soctile de ingegnyo. Usava con-

Il predicto Rogieri in multe chuose fo  
 bien condizionato et fo huomo grande  
 di statura et grosso di corpo et ebe il  
 vulto lionino e la voce rauca, homo 35  
 di sobctile ingegno, savio, proveduto.

A 1-2 per la ... Rogiere] *om.* GC 4 fo] *om.* N1, P2 5-6 in de lo ... soa] et moriò in eta de anni F, P2 6 LVIII] XLVIII P2 29 *tit. add.* N1, SN2, P3 32 Rogiere] fo *add.* F 34 subrauca] sua rauca SN1 || savro] sano GC, saudo SN2, P3

B 9-10 se uniò] fe unione E 15 pigliati] receptati E 27 magiore] principale E

A tinuamente pyu la raysione che la forca; ad acquistare terre et moneta era multo sollicito. In publico davante ala gente se mostrava fiere; in privato era multo benigno. Ali greci et ali sarracini era multo terrebele, et tenevali in grande temenza. Et in tucto lo tempo de sua signyora mantenne lo regno in grande iusticia, benignitate, et gracia, et fece fare in Cicilia multe ecclesie, palaczi, et iardini. In tempo de quisto re Rogiero la citate de Napoli unita fone colo regno.

62

*Roger's successor William ruled 15 years and died in Palermo. He was hated by his vassals, who imprisoned him and proclaimed his son king, but the son was killed by a stray arrow. King William was freed and wreaked vengeance on his vassals, and during his whole reign the kingdom was beset by scandal and rebellion.*

Alo quale re Rogiere soccese in de la signyoria re Guilielmo figlyolo suo lu quale visse in de signyoria anni XV et moriò in Palermo et fone sepellito in de la matre ecclesia in de lo anno de la etate soa XLVI. Fo lo re Guilielmo bello et grande de persone et de facze, et fo grosso et multo virtuoso in bactaglya. Et fo multo male voluto dali conti et baruni et vassalli, tanto che lo presero in Palermo et

64

*Regia se piu per ragione che per voluntade; in acquistare terre o dinari multo sobctile, sollicito, et disideroso. In publico ala gente se mostrava ferocie et in dil privato se mostrava alliegro, benegno e providuto. Ay sarrayni era multo terribele e sempre gli teneva socto gran timore. Resse il ryame in tucto'l tempo di suo regiemento in gran giostitia, benignitade et pace. Et fe hedificare multi castegli, ecclesie, palagi, et giardini.*

*Roger's successor William ruled 15 or 25 years. He was hated by his vassals, who imprisoned him and proclaimed his son king, but the son was killed by a stray arrow. King William was freed and wreaked vengeance on his vassals, and during his whole reign the kingdom was beset by scandal and rebellion. He died in Palermo. He built several castles in Naples.*

Morto il dicto re Rogieri chomo piacquie aglu altissimo Idio, si socciese al dominio Guiglielmo suo primogenito, il quale vixe al dominio anni XV o secundo un'altra opinione XXV. Et avenga che esso fosse stato bello e grande di soa persona et victorioso in bactaglia. In altro modo non fo bien fortunato, ma ebe mala fortuna et fo male amato da suo vassagli e male honorato. In tanto

A 1 pyu la] forza *add.* SN2, P3 2-3 terre ... era] era in moneta GC 3 sollicito] sulecto GC 4 in privato] alo occulto N1, SN2, P3, et secreto *add.* F, P2 5-6 Ali ... multo] et N1 7 temenza] timore GC 7-8 Et in ... mantenne] *om.* GC 10 gracia] grande N1 11 iardini] et castella *add.* P1, N1, P2, SN1, GC, SN2, P3 14 *tit. add.* N1, SN2, P3 29 matre] mayore SN1, P3 || ecclesia] de Palermo *add.* P1, F, N1, P2, GC, SN2, P3 30 XLVI] XLVII N1 32 grosso] grasso P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3

B 1 Regia] Regeva E 2 terre o dinari] et de mari E 5 se mostrava] *om.* E 25 re] *om.* E 28 al dominio] in signoria E 29 XXV] anni trenta E 34 fo male] poco E

A inpresonarelo, et arrobaro lo palaczo dove illo habitava et levaronde lo thisauro et cio che li trovaro in casa, et liberaro certi conti et baruni li quali illo tenea presuni. Et da poy possero ad cavallo lo figlyo de lo re primogenito lu quale se chyamava Rogiere duca de Puglya et portarolo per la terra gridando et dicendo, Viva nostro signyore lo re Rogiere cha non volemo per signyore pyu lo re Guilielmo suo patre che se fay guidare da Maio de Baro miraglya de lo riame che ey tiranno et ave posto lo riame in desensione et scandalo. Et da poy li tre iorni lo populo de Palermo armata manu assaltaro lo palaczo, in de lo quale insulto fo feruto de sagecta in de lo occhylo lo predicto duca che se affaczao in de la finestra de la Torre Pisana per vedere lo populo et reingraciarelo, de la quale ferita moriò incontenente. Et da poy lo re fo liberato et li conti et li baruni se salvaro in de le loro terre et impero tucti li tempi de la signyoria sua fo lo riame in grande scandalo et rebellione tanto in Ciciaqua quanto in Calabria et in Puglya, et inpercio fo besognyo che se facessero grande guerre et vendecte. Lo caporale de la presa de lo re, et de la maiure parte de lo scandalo de lo riame, fo uno barone de Ciciaqua che

che i baroni se li ribellero ala cita di B Palermo et muosserosse contra luy. E s'il pigliaro in dil suo palagio e puoserollo in pregione. E puosero a sacco tucte le soe gioye e thesoro 5 cho ogni bene ch'egli avia. Et apponevanolli che pel consiglio di misser Mayo di Varo miraglio dil ryame di Scicilia facto et creyado da luy, il dicto re era un tirampno e mal gover- 10 nava il suo ryame. Et volendo i dicti baroni colorire et corregiere lor tradimento e difecto, si pigliaro per re et signiore Rogieri suo figliuolo primogenito il quali era duca di Puglia. Et 15 ferolu cavalcare per la cita et andavano gridando, Viva et regnie il nostro signiore re Rogieri e non il padre suo re Guilielmo il quale a posto scandalo et divigione al ryame. Dopo 20 tre di fo facta l'altra mocione pel popolo cha volevano liberare re Guiglielmo il quali era im pregione. Et si diero un altro assalto al palagio. In dil quale assalto volendose affac- 25 zare ad una finestra dil palagio ad una torre la qual se chiamava la Torre Pisana il dicto re Rogieri figliuolo dil re Guiglielmo si fo ferito negli occhi di una sagecta per la qual miserabile 30 ferita fo morto. Videndo questo tanto i baroni quanto il populo per mitigare un puogho il dolore paterno di re

A 2 habitava] stava in habitacione *N1*, stava *SN1* 5 possero] possexero *N1* 6-7 de lo ... primogenito] *om. SN1*, primogenito per re *GC* 7 chyamava] chiama *P3* 8 Puglya] et primogenito *add. SN1* 9 gridando et dicendo] gridando *F, N1, SN1, SN2, P3, om. P2* 10 signyore lo] *om. SN1* 10-11 Rogiere ... re] *om. N1* 11 per signyore ... re] piu per re lo signiore *GC* 12-13 de Baro] libero *SN1* 13 riame] mare *SN1* 16 iorni] di *SN2, P3* 16-17 armata manu] *om. GC* 23 Et] cosci *add. F, P2* 25-26 et impero ... sua] *om. F, P2* 25 impero (*SN1*) inplero *P1, M1, N, GC, om. SN2, P3* || tempi] templi *N1* 27 rebellione] rebellacione *P1, F, N1, P2*, tribulatione *SN2, P3* 31 caporale de] caporale che fo a *F, P2* 32-33 de lo riame] *om. P2* 33-252.1 che se chyamao] chiamato *SN1*

B 8 miraglio] megio *E* 13-15 et signiore ... Puglia] il signor di Puglia Rogieri suo figliolo *E* 18 signiore] *om. E* 21 tre di] *om. E* || mocione] deliberatione *E* 24 si diero] fecero *E* 25-26 affaczare] affare *E* 27 chiamava] chiama *E* 33 paterno] pateron *E*

A se chyamao Mactheo Bunella lo quale de propria mano uccise lo predicto miraglya. Lo quale Mactheo in processo de tempo fo ponito como ad traditore de suo signyore.

Guiglielmo il qual avia veduto il B suo figliuolo morto chosi miserabilmente, si'l liberaro dal carcere et ristituerolo al suo dominio et libertade. Liberado il re Guiglielmo, i baroni 5 cominciaron a dobitare et impero tucti fugiero alle fortelicze loro faciendose sighuri. Per la qual chuosa in tucto'l tempo dil suo regiemento l'insola di Sicilia e tucto il ryame fo in briga, divi- 10 gione, et ribellione. Et per questi commessi delicti et peccati fuoron facte gran vendecte. Et inter l'altre fo facta la ponicion di misser Mactheo Bimula, il quale colle sue proprie mano avia 15 occiso il miraglio di Sicilia, gran consigliere et collaterale di lo dicto re Guiglielmo, il quale fo capitano et ordinadore di tucta la ribellione predicta. Et finalmente il predicto re Gui- 20 glielmo morì im Palermo e fo sepolito ala maggiore ecclesia di Palermo in dill'anno dilla eta soa quarantasey et in dill'anno domini M C LXX. In dil qual tempo o puogo nansi fo facte 25 il Castello di Capoana sopra la Porta Capoana e l'arco grande dil Castello del Ovo e l'uno e l'altro fuoron facti prey normandi et impero al tempo di mo se chiama la Normandia. 30

A 1 chyamao] chiama *N1* 3 miraglya] de lo dicto re *add. N1*, delo re *add. SN2, P3*  
3-4 processo de] breve *F, P2* 5 signyore] et quisto fo chiamato lo re male Guglielmo  
*add. SN1*

B 4 et libertade] *om. E* 6 dobitare] per lo fallo comesso *add. E* 14 Bimula] Vonella *E*  
26-27 sopra ... Capoana] *om. E* 28 del Ovo (*E*) Nuovo *PL* 29-30 di mo] diruo *E*

63

A *William's son and successor William the Good ruled for 25 years and was buried in Palermo. He benefited the kingdom and ruled it in peace, reinstating the rebellious lords exiled by his father. He was succeeded by Constance, daughter of Roger II, whom the Church released from her monastic vows and married to the emperor Henry. But Tancred, supported by the counts and barons, prevented Henry from taking the kingdom for ten years. When he died, Henry took the kingdom and ruled tyrannically. Queen Constance was succeeded by her son Frederick, aged five. He died in Fiorentino in Apulia and was buried in Palermo.*

Alo quale re Guilielmo succese in de la signyoria lo re Guilielmo bono, figlyolo suo, loquale era de anni XI. Et visse in de la signyoria anni XXV et foy morto in Palermo sencza herede et foy sepellito in de la maiure ecclesia in de lo anno de la etate sua XXXVI. Loquale re Guilielmo fece grandissime beneficij in de lo regno in generale et speciale et tenne lo regno in pace tucto lo tempo de la signyoria sua. Lo quale re Guilielmo secundo foy homo de grande iusticia et multo liberale et graciosu. Et perdonao ad tucti lo conti, baruni, et cittadini che erano scaczati de lo riame per lo re Guilielmo suo patre, et rendeò a.lloro tucte le castella et le terre le quale erano levate

65

*William's son and successor William II reinstated all the rebellious lords dispossessed by his father and ruled with great virtue. He especially loved the Neapolitans and Palermitans, and enriched the talented and literate. He ruled 25 years and was buried in Palermo.*

Al qual Guiglielmo re socciese Guiglielmo suo figliuolo secundogenito in dil ryame et in tucto il suo dominio il quale il misericordioso Dio si dotò tanto di virtu che tucti i ribelli et inimici dil padre di li quali la maggior parte n'erano stati discacziati si gli ridusse alle proprie citade et fe et soa special benivolencia. Ay quay perdonò ogni pena la quale avessono dovuta sostenere per loro offese et colpe et ristitoy a tucti i loro baronie, contati, et castella di i quay erano stati privati per loro mali meriti et operacioni. Fo il predicto re giostifico, larghissimo, et liberale, graciosu et pietosu, in tanto che tucto il tempo di soa vita resse il ryame in

A 1 *tit. add.* N1, SN2, P3 19 Alo quale] [D]e poi lo F, P2 || quale] *om.* P1, N1, SN2, P3  
 20 Guilielmo] uno *add.* GC 21 suo] chiamato era *add.* GC 21-22 Et ... XXV] *om.* GC  
 23 foy morto] poi moriò F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 || sencza herede] *om.* P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3  
 24 foy] *om.* N1 || maiure] matre SN1 27 beneficij] *repet.* N1 28 speciale] spirituale F,  
 particulari SN2, P3 30 secundo] *om.* F 31 homo] *om.* SN1 34 Guilielmo] *om.* SN1  
 35 suo] lloro GC 36 erano] tucte *add.* GC

B 22 si] salvò et E 27 et soa ... benivolencia] li suo benivolenti E 28-29 avessono  
 dovuta] dovesseno haver E 33 Fo] Et cosi E



A et tornaui in sua gracia et fedelitate. Et inperero tucto lo tempo de la sua signyoria resse lo riame in pace et in tranquillitate sencza gravare li vassalli de colte ne nde date, et inpercio fo multo amato da li vassalli et fo chyamato lo bono re Guilielmo.

buona giosticia, prosperitade, et pace. B Non puose may all'uomini dil regnio colte, daciai, ni gravacioni ni servigii personali. Si amò multo i napolitani e quey di Palermo, et maximamente 5 arricchava li huomini avantagiati e licterati, et sempre gl'incoragiava al migliore. Fo eciamdio casto et moderato; al parlamento facieva disciernerere et vedere per ogni chomune persona sempre quel ch'era il meglio. E luy era bello di persona et risplendente parlatore. Per le quale chuose et multe altre soe virtute dele quali era chiaro et adornato, si fo chiamato il 15 buon re Guiglielmo e chosi fo scripto ala soa sepoltura. Costuy fo assumpto al dominio et coronato in dill'anno di la soa eta XI et visse al dominio anni XXV. Et fo morto senza herede 20 in dill'anno di la soa eta XXXVI et fo sepellito ala maggiore ecclesia di Palermo nell'anno domini M C LXX-XVI.

66-68

25

(= Villani VI: 1-3, via the  
"Southernized Villani" chs. 12-14)

*The career of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa.*

A 2 inperero] poi *N*<sub>1</sub>, *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub>, *om.* *F*; *P*<sub>2</sub> 3 et in] bona *add.* *F*; *P*<sub>2</sub> 3-4 et in tranquillitate] *om.* *SN*<sub>1</sub> 5 colte ... date] collene de altre *GC* || multo] *om.* *P*<sub>1</sub>, *F*, *N*<sub>1</sub>, *P*<sub>2</sub>, *SN*<sub>2</sub>, *P*<sub>3</sub>

B 7 incoragiava] iterograva *E* 9 al parlamento] *om.* *E* 17 fo assumpto] ad sancto *E* 22 maggiore] principal *E*

A

Alo quale re Guilielmo succese indela signyoria la regina Costanza figlya de lo supradicto Rogiere la quale era stata monaca in Palermo. Per comandamento de la sancta ecclesia fo assoluta de la observacione de la religione et copulata in matrimonio alo imperatore Herrico che fo nato de la casa de lo duca de Suavia.

De li quali fo nato Frederico in de la citate de Esi et in de lo anno de la dominica incarnacione M C LXXX VIII de lo iorno de sancto Stephano.

*William the Good was succeeded by his aunt Constance, whom the Church released from her monastic vows and married to the emperor Henry. But the people hated German rule and supported Tancred, and Henry could not take the kingdom until he died. Then Henry and Constance took the kingdom and ruled tyrannically until their deaths.*

Morto finalmente il dicto re buon Guilielmo senza legitima herede chomè decto, socciese al dominio madama Gostansa habbatessa al monastero di Sancta Maria di Palermo figliuola dil re Rogieri avo di questo re buon Guiglielmo. La quale per comandamento di la santa madre ecclesia di Roma sciolta di la observancia di la riligion soa fo data per moglie a gl'imperadore Herrico secondo di la nobil progenie di Soavia figliuolo dil dicto Federico Barbarosso, la quali era di eta di anni L. El dicto imperadore Herrico per la dicta moglie ebe il ryame di Scicilia.

Il quale giustamente socciedeva la dicta madamma Gostansa herede legetima di i segniori Vescardi. Di la quale fo nato Federico secundo in di la cita di Exu in di la Magnia in dill'anno di xpo M C LXXX VIII.

A 12 Alo quale] Lo quali lo GC || re Guilielmo] *om.* SN1 14 supradicto] re *add.* SN1, SN2, P3 15 monaca ... Palermo] menata insula mo[nasterio?] GC 17 observacione] et *add.* SN2, P3 || de la] sancta *add.* GC || religione] regione N1 19–20 la casa ... duca] lo imperatore GC || de lo duca] *om.* P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 29 citate de Esi] cita et si ossi GC || Esi] Giesci N1, Giesi SN2, Gissi P3 30 dominica] *om.* N1, SN2, P3 30–31 LXXX VIII] LXXXX VIII F, N1, P2, SN2, P3, LXXX VIII GC

B 17–18 questo re buon] re E 19 santa] *om.* E 20–21 observancia di la] *om.* E 24 dicto] imperadore *add.* E 33 VIII] VIII E

A Ma lo sopradicto imperatore non potea obtinire lo riame inpercio che Tucredo, figlyolo bastardo de lo duca Rogiere che fo figlyo de lo predicto re Rogiere, con consentimento et volentate de li conti et baruni de lo riame tenea lo riame occupato et intitulative re et regnao anni X et da poy moriò. Et da poy venne lo predicto imperatore Herrico cola regina Costanza sua moglyere et intrao alo riame et ottenelo in de lo anno de la dominica incarnacione Mille C LXXX VIII. Li quali vissi in de la signyoria de lo riame anni IIII et fo morto ad Messina, dove moriò poco tempo poy la regina Costanza sua moglyere et foro sepeliti ad Palermo a la maiure ecclesia. Lo predicto inperatore como tyranno prese multi conti et barune de lo riame et feceli cecare et poy li mandao presuni in de la Magnya co.loro figlyoli et muglyere.

Et ala soa nacione fuoron pre- B  
senti multi signiori et dompne per  
quel che s'avesse possuto dire. Per che  
madamma Gostansa mostrava aver  
passata la eta di far figliuoli. Et è 5  
da savere che Tancredo bastardo di  
Viscardi chon consciensa di i signiori  
e citadini dil ryame signiorigiò il  
ryame contro il debito per che i  
signiori et citadin dil ryame aviano 10  
multo in hodio la segnoria thodescha.  
El dicto Tancredo regniò anni cinque.  
El dicto imperadore Herrico in vita di  
Tancredo non puocte may obtinire il  
ryame. Morto Tancredo gl'imperador 15  
Herrico et Gostansa soa moglie ven-  
nero et pigliaro pacificamente il ryame  
et cominciaron a vivere tirapnescha-  
mente et non consideravan che la  
piu gran vendecta chey se possa fare 20  
quando se puo divengiare si è di per-  
donare. Incominciaron a volere pigliar  
vendecta di quey c'aviano hobedito a  
Tancredo. Et multi conti et baroni dil  
ryame si fe ciecare et mandògli pre- 25  
gioni chon lor moglie et figliuoli nela  
Magnia e vixe al ryame anni quat-  
tro. In dil qual tempo puoche chuose  
fe. Et dopo fo morto a Messcina in  
anno domini M C LXXXX VIII et 30  
infra quell'anno fo morta madamma  
Gostansa in buona dispositione et fo  
sepellita una co gl'imperadore Herrico

A 1 Ma] A N1 2-5 inpercio che ... re Rogiere] da Tancredi nepote de Roberto Viscardo loquale se era factu re SN1 3-4 de lo ... Rogiere] *om.* N1, SN2, P3 || de lo duca ... figlyo] de lo duca Rogeri che fo figlio *add.* GC 4-5 che fo ... Rogiere] *om.* P2 5 con] *om.* F 6 riame] lo quale *add.* SN1 7 intitulative] intitolato P2 9 Et da poy] *om.* GC 10 cola regina] con F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 13 C (P1)] *om.* M1, GC || LXXX VIII] LXXXX VIII F, N1, P2, SN2, P3, LXX VIII GC 14 de la signyoria] *om.* P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 14-15 de lo riame] *om.* GC 15 fo morto] poi moriò F, P2, SN2, P3 16 poco tempo] *om.* P2 18 maiure] matre N1, SN2, P3 21 cecare] cercare GC

B 6 savere] scrivere E || bastardo] Viscardo E 7 consciensa] consentimento E 8-9 signiorigiò ... ryame] *om.* E 12 cinque] dieci E 14-15 il ryame] *om.* E 21 quando] lo homo *add.* E 22 volere] *om.* E 25 ciecare] carcerare E 33 Herrico] *om.* E

A Ala quale regina Costanza succese in de la signyoria de lo riame Frederico suo figlyolo loquale era de anni V quando moriò lo patre. Loquale Frederico visse in de la signyoria de lo riame anni VI et de lo inperio de Roma anni XXXII et de lo riame de Ierusalem anni XXVIII. Loquale Frederico moriò in Puglya in de lo castello che se chyama Florentino et fo sepellito in Palermo in de lo anno de la etate sua LVI in de lo anno de la dominica incarnatione M CC LI, lo iorno de sabbato, che foy ali XXIII de dicembro, la festa de sancta Lucia. B

5

10

15

64

*Emperor Frederick ruled as a tyrant, hanging or burning many lords and their wives and children.*

70

*Frederick succeeded his mother and father and ruled well while he was governed by tutors, but when he came of age he became a tyrant, hanging or burning many lords and their children. He was excommunicated and finally deposed by the pope at the Council of Lyons. He died in Fiorentino in Apulia and was buried in Palermo.* 20

25

Lo predicto inperatore Federico como ad tyranno fece prendere multi conti et baruni de lo regno co.loro muglyere et figlyoli, de li quali alcune fece inpendere at alcuni co.loro muglyere et figlyoli fece ardere.

Questo Federico secondo socciese al padre et ala madre in tucto lor dominio e per fi che esso fo socto la governacione di totori, ministrao et governao biene il ryame. Ma dopo che venne ad eta perfecta, se fe un gran tirapno et suspecto. Et per 30

A 2 de la signyoria] *om.* GC 3-6 V quando ... anni] *om.* GC 5-6 de lo riame] *om.* N1 6 VI] LXVI P2 || inperio] impercio GC 7-8 XXXII ... anni] *om.* SN2, P3 9 Puglya] et delo riame de Ierusalem anni XXVIII et moriò *add.* SN2, P3 10 chyama] chiamao GC 12 LVI] LXVI P2 12-13 in de ... incarnatione] et ne P2 12 de la] de la *add.* GC 12-13 de la ... incarnatione] *om.* SN1 || incarnatione (P1)] *om.* M1, GC 13 LI] LII P2 13-14 lo iorno ... dicembro] in F, P2, che è *add.* SN1 14 XXIII] XIII P1, SN1, GC, SN2, P3 15 Lucia] de decembro *add.* F, P2 16 *tit. add.* N1, SN2, P3 27 prendere] *om.* P2, piglare GC 29-30 inpendere] impicare P2

B 1 maggiore] principal E 2 figliuolo suo] *om.* E 3 cinque] e non piu *add.* E

A

la soa tirampnia et sospiczione fe **B**  
 prendere multi conti et baroni dil  
 ryame ey figlioli, di li quali alchuni fe  
 ardere, alchuni chon gran vergogna  
 fe impendere. Et regniò in dil domi- 5  
 nio anni LI, et in digl'imperio romano  
 anni XXXII et in del titolo dil ryame  
 di Jherusalem anni XXVIII. Fo huomo  
 cauto, malvagio, e savio.

65

10

*Frederick was excommunicated and  
 deposed by the pope at the Council  
 of Lyons. He was succeeded by his  
 son Conrad, who beseiged and greatly  
 damaged Naples. It surrendered out of  
 hunger, but violating his promise, Con-  
 rad destroyed its walls and exiled many  
 men.*

15

Lo predicto inperatore Federico fo  
 scomunicato et deposto de la digni-  
 tate de lo imperio et de lo riame per  
 papa Innocencio quarto in de lo con-  
 siglyo che fo factò et celebrato a.Llione  
 sopra lo Rodano in de lo anno de la  
 dominica incarnacione MCC XLV de  
 la III indicione in de la vigilia de sancta  
 Maria Magdalena.

Il quale luongo tempo vixè excomi-  
 nicato et mal voluto di la gracia di 20  
 la madre ecclesia di Roma, la qual  
 chon tucta soa potensa perseguitava,  
 in tanto che quactro cardinali ebe pre-  
 gioni in de le soe mano.

E finalmente vinciendo la chiesa di 25  
 Roma di la quale i ghovernatori puo-  
 teno patere pena per un tempo ma  
 non puonno perire, fo disposto Fede-  
 rico per papa Innocencio quarto in  
 dil consiglio factò in Londonia sovra'l 30  
 Rodano di la dignita imperiale e dil  
 rigiemento dil ryame di Scicilia in  
 dill'anno domini M CC XL VIII, in di  
 la vigilia di la Magdalena. E dopo fo  
 morto a Fiorentino cita di Puglia e'l 35  
 suo corpo sepellito im Palermo anno  
 domini M CC LI, XI ind., ay di XIII di  
 diciembro, di eta di anni LVI.

A 10 *cap. 64 et 65 uniti SN1, tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 21 imperio et (F)] imperio P1, M1, GC  
 23 che] et SN1 24-25 la ... incarnacione] lo nostro signore Ihu xpo SN1 25 XLV] LV  
 GC 26 III] XIII SN1

B 3 alchuni] *om. E* 9 cauto] molto *E* 20-21 gracia di la] sancta *add. E* 33 XL] XXX *E*  
 34 vigilia di la] *om. E* 37 ay di XIII] XXIII *E*

71

A

*Pope Innocent IV came to Naples in Frederick's time, fell ill and died. He was buried in the Naples cathedral.* B

Innocencio papa anno domini M CC 5  
LIII in tempo di Federico secundo  
venne in Napoli. Et dopo che fo  
gionto in Napoli, puogho tempo po si  
infirmò et di quella infermita fo morto  
nel dì di sancta Lucia et fo sepellito ala 10  
magiore ecclesia di Napoli dove sta la  
soa sepultura chol suo epitaphio multo  
bien ad se convenebele.

72

*Frederick's son Conrad, a tyrant and rebel against the Church, was cruel to the Neapolitans who wished to obey the Church. He besieged the city and then destroyed its walls, violating the terms of their agreement. One of his spies within the city sent a message explaining how to conquer it. Conrad died by divine judgment in Germany.* 15

Alo quale inperatore Federico succese in de la signyoria de lo riame de Cicia-  
lia lo re Corrado figlyolo suo lo quale  
visse in de la signyoria anni II. Lo  
quale assediao et dampnificao multo  
la citate de Napoli la quale per fame  
se rendiò ale mano soy. Et contra ali  
pacti li fece abactere et destrugere le  
mura de la terra et fece scaczare multi  
homine de li miglyuri de la terra.

Corrado figliuolo dil dicto Federico  
secondo essendo ribello ala sancta 25  
cchiesa di Roma vivendo tirapnica-  
mente fo molto crodele contro i napolitani impero che no gli voliano hobe-  
dire contro la volunta di la sancta  
madre ecclesia ala quale appartiene il 30  
dricito dominio dil ryame. Impero esso  
infiamato contro la dicta cita ey suo  
citadini, volendo distrugiere la dicta  
cita, si puose campo a Carbonara dove  
dimorò luongo tempo. Et non pos- 35  
sendo fare nente, venne ad concordia  
chon loro, che gli dovesse perdo-

A 25-27 de Cicia ... signyoria] *om.* GC 26 Corrado] Correndo SN1 28 dampnificao] dagnificò P1 28-29 multo la] multe GC 29 fame] fama N1, GC 31 pacti (SN1)] facti che M1, GC, pacti che P1, F, N1, P2 || et destrugere] *om.* SN1 32-33 multi homine] *om.* P2 33 terra] cita GC

B 7 venne] venuto E 8 gionto in Napoli] venuto E 11 maggiore] principale E 31 dricito] dicto E 33-34 dicta cita] *om.* E 36-37 concordia] cordie E

nare all'uomini et loro bieni et essi gli **B**  
 davano il dominio di la cita et chosi  
 fo facto. Et intrò nella cita et fe abbac-  
 tere le mura antique di la cita le quali  
 erano piu belle c'avesse alcuna cita 5  
 dil mondo. Et dopo venendo icontra  
 a soe pro promessioni, multi cittadini  
 persecutò. Quando il dicto Corrado  
 stava all'assedio nansi Napoli, un suo  
 spione stava drento la terra et tragieva 10  
 vertoni per una sagiectera inpennati  
 di carti. In de le quali carti scriveva  
 multe chuose et specialmente di quello  
 che.sse faceva in di la cita. Et inter  
 l'altre volte una fiata scripse questi 15  
 versi:

Mutus regalis latitans in Parthono-  
 peo  
 Vera referre studet auxiliante Deo  
 Parthonope fexa prehest qui 20  
 dominaris.  
 Si bene claudantur hostia clausa  
 maris  
 Nec minus infestat fundaque  
 marmora iacit 25  
 Nam mora victores continuata facit.

Di i quay versi la sentensa si è questa.  
 Uno il quale non po parlare publica-  
 mente al re per parte soa sta nascho-  
 sto drento Napoli, il quale studia di 30  
 dire la verita chol favore di Dio. Dico  
 a te il quale signiorigi che Napoli è  
 lassa et stanca et maximamente se  
 lla assedii per mare. Anche il traboc-  
 cho il quale mena chola fiondea le 35  
 pietre gli da grande affanno. Et per  
 tanto sta fermo che la perseveransia  
 fa l'uomini vinciedori. Il qual Corrado  
 partendose da Napoli fo morto nella  
 Magnia per divino giodicio et visse 40  
 nella soa signioria et dominio anni tre.

**B** 2 davano] donono *E* 4 le mura] le le mura *PL* 5 alcuna] niuna *E* 6-8 icontra  
 ... persecutò] ad sue promsse contra multi cittadini *E* 9 nansi] de *E* 21 dominaris]  
 dominatus *E* 24 fundaque] funda *E* 26 Nam] in *add.* *E* 31 Dico] *om.* *E* 32 che  
 Napoli] *om.* *E* 35 fiondea] fronda *E*

After Conrad's death, Manfred took **B**  
 control of the kingdom against the  
 Church's wishes. The pope sent Charles  
 of Anjou to conquer the kingdom. He **5**  
 fought Manfred at Benevento, where  
 Charles fought manfully and Manfred  
 died. Charles ruled 18 years, died in  
 Foggia, and was buried in the Naples  
 cathedral. He created four counts dur- **10**  
 ing his reign.

Po la morte dil dicto Corrado rignìo et  
 signorigiò Monfreda figliuol bastardo  
 di Federico. Il quale primo era stato **15**  
 princiepe di Taranto et di lo Honore  
 et di Monte Sancto Angelo signiore.  
 Il quale eciamdio era stato baglio  
 et tutore dil dicto Corrado il quali  
 era rimasto popillo secundo che lassò  
 al testamento Federico padre suo. Et **20**  
 tinendo el ryame in titulo di baglio  
 et di tutore chon frode et contumace-  
 mente contro la volunta di la sancta  
 cchiesa di Roma. Impero papa Chie- **25**  
 mento quarto si chiamò Karlo primo  
 conte di Provensa et duca di Angio  
 che venisse ad conquistarese il ryame  
 di Scicilia et tenerelo da la sancta  
 madre ecclesia di Roma per censo di **30**  
 undici milia unce per anno, octomi-  
 lia pel ryame et tre milia per Tri-  
 naclia, la qual mo se chiama Scici-  
 lia socto cierti pacti et condicioni. Il  
 quale Karlo in dill'anno domini M CC **35**  
 LXV al quarto dì di novembro XI ind.,  
 venne et intrò nel ryame chon poten-  
 sia et armata manu et chon molti gen-  
 tiluomini fiancieschi, provensani, et di  
 molti altri linguagi, cio è di Boemia,  
 di Damartino, di Varo, di Solia, di **40**  
 Iamvilla, di Lautro, di Standardi, di

**B** 12 rignìo et] seguite *E* 15 lo Honore] Livore *E* 22-23 contumacemente] tradimento *E*  
 23-24 sancta ... Roma] ecclesia romana *E* 27 conquistarese] acquitar *E* 34 domini]  
 del signore *E* 41 Lautro] Lantrico *E* || Standardi] Stacardi *E*



Dianisiaco, di Laghonessa, di Balgi, di **B**  
 Sabrano, di Bauzo, et di Aghoto. Et  
 questi fuoron fiancieschi. Et di pro-  
 vensani fuoron i Cantelmi, di Scocto, 5  
 di Arthois, chon molti altri. Al quale  
 Karlo primo creato re per la ecclesia  
 romana se contrapuose il decto Mon-  
 freda presso a Benevento. E dopo di  
 alchune rischosse si fo ordinato il di  
 di la bactaglia in dil qual di fo com- 10  
 bactuto biene et aspramente inter l'una  
 et l'altra parte. In dil qual bactaglia  
 fo morto il dicto Monfreda cavalieri  
 extrenuo et multi nobili huomini vi 15  
 pererono. Il decto Monfreda fo tro-  
 vado morto fuor dil campo bien da  
 quactro miglia di presso al fyume di  
 Monte Verde. Il quale Karlo se portò  
 in di la dicta bactaglia si virilmente 20  
 et cavallarescamente faciendo l'officio  
 suo choma buon cavalieri et buon  
 maestro di guerra et defendendo se da  
 man dricta et da man sinistra contro  
 diece cavalieri i quay aviano giurata la 25  
 morte contro di re Karlo. Di i quay  
 fo il primo misser Bernardo Casta-  
 gnia, misser Karlo Capecie cavalier di  
 Napoli che nanti ay suo pie fuoron  
 tucti oczisi excepto il cavalier napoli- 30  
 tano il qual per forza d'arme se fe far  
 la via per mezo delle schiere di ine-  
 mici et fogì sano et salvo et scampò  
 da la morte. Il quale Karlo visse in  
 dil dominio dil ryame di Scicilia anni 35  
 diciecto et fo morto a Fogia cita di  
 Puglia et sepellito nella maggiore eccle-  
 sia di Napoli in anno domini M CC  
 LXXXV al septimo di di iennayo, XIII  
 ind. Et in dil suo tempo si fe quactro 40  
 gentiluomini conti, i quay di titolo di  
 contado gli honorò, cio è, misser Gao-  
 tieri di Breona conte di Lecze, mis-

**B** 1 Dianisiaco] Damsiaco *E* 2 Sabrano] Sanbano *E* 3-4 provensani] Provenza *E*  
 4 Cantelmi] Cancelani *E* 11 biene] Benevento *E* 14 extrenuo] e molti napolitani et  
 altri cittadini e forestieri *add. E* 21 buon] *om. E* 31 delle] de la giente d'arme et *E*  
 37 domini] del signore *E* 41-42 Gaotieri] Gentil *E*

A

66

*Manfred fraudulently succeeded Conrad, having publicized the false news that Conrad's son Conradin had died in Germany. He ruled for ten years and fought Charles of Anjou at Benevento, where he died.*

Alo quale re Corrado soccese fraudulentemente Manfreda frate suo bastardo. Lo quale Manfreda fece venire false novelle da la Magnya et fece publicare per lo riame cha Corradino figlyolo de lo predicto re Corrado lu quale era in de la Magnya era morto. Et de voluntate de li conti et de li baruni de lo regno et contra ala voluntate de lo papa se fece incoronare re. Lu quale re regnyò in de la signyoria anni X et da poy combactèò colo re Carlo primo appresso de Benevento dove fo sconficto et morto. Fine alo tempo de lo predicto re Manfreda li ri de quisto regnyo se faceano incoronare in Palermo a qualunca prelato voleano, senza adimandare licencia da lo papa.

ser Rogier di Scocto conte di Mar- B  
sico, misser [...] Ruffo conte di Can-  
tansano, misser Bertiraymo dil Bauzo  
conte di Avellino.

74

*At Conrad's death Manfred published false letters claiming that Conrad's son Conradin had died in Germany, so that he could rule the kingdom. He ruled for ten years.*

5

10

In qual manera regniò contro la ecclesia di Roma et soa voluntade: è da savere che morto che fo il re Corrado fradello dil dicto Monfreda il quali era regniato anni tre si gli era rimasto un figliuolo il quale se chiamava Corradino il quali era nella Magnia. Il dicto Monfreda fe dire et publicare per false lictere le quali fe venire como venissono da la Magnia che Corradino suo nipote gli dovia socciedere a Corrado suo padre si era morto. Acioche luy podesse occupare il dominio e'l ryame. Et tanto seppe et puocete ordinare che di volunta et consciensa di li conti et baroni dil ryame fo coronato re contro la volunta dil papa. Il qual Monfreda regniò anni diece. Et in quel tempo i ri dil ryame di Scicilia se solevano coronare im Palermo da un prelato il quale piaceva ad essi senza licensa dil papa. Et da per fi che'l dicto Monfreda fo coronato fo sempre bagho et tutore di Corrado suo fradello.

15

20

25

30

35

A 5 cap. 65 et 66 uniti GC, tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 12 Corrado] Carlo N1 13 frate] om. GC 16 cha] como SN1 17 figlyolo ... Corrado] suo nepote SN1 || Corrado] Corradino N1 18 era (N1)] om. M1, P1, SN2, P3 19-21 de li conti ... voluntate] om. GC 22 re] om. N1 25 sconficto] GC 26 re] om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 27 regnyo] reame GC 28 prelato] parlato F, N1

B 13 voluntade] el dicto Manfredo add. E 20 fe ... como] mostrò che E 22-23 a ... padre] om. E 26 consciensa] consentimento E 31 solevano (E)] rolevano PL

67

75B-89B

A *Charles I entered the kingdom with the Church's blessing and fought Manfred at Benevento. Manfred died and Charles received the kingdom, which he ruled for 18 years. He died in Foggia and was buried in the Naples cathedral.*

(= Villani VII: 87-91, VIII: 1-10, via the "Southernized Villani" chs. 38-52)

5

*Charles I's conquest of the kingdom of Sicily.*

Sequente appresso chillo anno de la dominica incarnacione MCC LXV, lo quarto iorno de novembro, ind. IX, lo re Carlo primo, per concessione che li fo facta per papa Clemento quarto de lo riame de Cicilia, intrao in de lo riamo armata mano con grande compagna de francischi, provenczani, et latine, et conbactiò colo supradicto re Manfreda appresso ad Benevento et appe victoria de li soy inimici. In de la quale bactaglya lo predicto re Manfreda fo morto. Lo re Carlo recipiò tucto lo riame socto sua signyoria et visse in de la signyoria anni XVIII et moriò ad Fogia, citate de Puglya, et foy sepellito in de la maiure ecclesie de Napoli in de lo anno de la dominica incarnacione MCC LXXXV ali VII iorni de jennaro de la XIII ind.

10

15

20

25

A 1 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 8 chillo] in lo *SN1* || chillo anno (*P1*)] che l'anno *M1* 8-9 la ... incarnacione] lo nostro signore Ihu x<sup>o</sup> *SN1* 9 LXV] XLV *F, P2, SN2, P3, LV GC* 10 quarto] quale *N1* || iorno] di *SN1* || IX] XI *GC* 11-12 concessione ... fo] consentione allui *P2* 14 armata] chiamato *GC* || con] *om. GC* 21 sua] inclita *GC* 22 la] sua *add. SN1* || XVIII] et nove misi *add. SN1* 24 foy] fo portato et *F, N1, SN2, P3*, portato et *P2* 25-26 de ... incarnacione] domini *N1, SN1, SN2, P3* || dominica] *om. GC* 26 LXXXV] LXXXVIII *GC* 27 iorni] *om. GC*, di *SN2, P3*

68

A *Two years into Charles' reign, Conradin came with an army from Germany to retake the kingdom. In the battle with Charles, Conradin and some of his generals were captured and later beheaded in Naples.*

Ali duy anni poy lo predicto re Carlo signyoriaio lo regno, venne Corradino figlyolo de lo predicto re Corrado colo duca de Osterlich con multi grandi homine de la Magnya et con dompno Herrico frate de lo re Spagnya et con multi grandi homine de Spagnya et colo conte Gado de Pisa con multi lombardi, tuscani, et ytaliani, per levare lo riamo alo re Carlo. Ma lo predicto re Carlo non aspectao che intrassero lo riame ma li insiò in nanti fine de lo riame in quillo loco che se chyama la Victoria. Et loco conbactiò con ipso ali XI iorni de augusto de la XI ind. alo anno de la dominica incarnacione MCC LXVIII

90

B *Two years into Charles' reign, Conradin came with an army from Germany to retake the kingdom. Charles asked Érarde de Valéry to lead his army. Thanks to Érarde's clever tactics, Charles' army won. Conradin and some of his generals were captured and later beheaded in Naples. Charles built a monastery in memory of the victory. Then Charles gathered an army to conquer the empire of Rome [sic] but was foiled by the rebellion of Sicily, organized by Giovanni di Procida. Charles created four counts during his reign.*

[Poi che el dicto re Carlo havia regnato anni doi, Corradino figliolo del re Corrado con multi altri signori venne di Allamagna, et don Arrigo figliolo del re de Spagna con grande compagnia de spagnoli et col conte Gado de Pisa, con gran compagnia de lombardi et d'altri taliani per prhendere el reame, lo quale lui se credeva havere per successione del patre. Sentendo el re Carlo la venuta de Corradino, stando in gran pensieri et disposto andargli incontro fuor del regno, si fo dicto ad re Carlo per un cavaliere francese che misser Alardi il vechio andando in oltra mare era pervenuto al porto de Napoli. Per la qual cosa re Carlo cavalcò al porto et fe chiamare Misser Alardo, il quale venuto, gli fe grande honore et menòllo al suo castello. Et intro l'altre cose dicte per lui si'l preghò che per suo amore il dovesse

A 1 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 17 signyoriaio] signoriando SN1 || lo regno] *om. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || venne] viro GC 18-19 re Corrado] re Corradino N1, Reccardo GC 22-23 et con multi ... Spagnya] *om. N1, P2* 22 grandi] *om. SN1*, altri GC 22-23 de Spagnya] dela Magna SN2, P3 23 Gado] Gago P1, F, N1, SN2, Guido SN1, de Gago GC, P3 24-25 con multi lombardi ... levare] *om. GC* 25-28 alo re ... quillo loco] *om. N1* 26 Ma ... Carlo] *om. GC* 27-28 in nanti] incontra P2, SN1 28 de lo riame ... loco] a.cquillo loco de lo riyame P1, F, P2, SN2, P3 30 iorni] di F, N1, SN2, P3, *om. GC* 31 dominica] *om. SN1*

B 16-266.9 16-266.9 Poi ... intento (E)] *fol. om. PL*

consigliare et aiutare contra el suo ini- **B**  
 mico Corradino, el qual era venuto ad  
 imbandire el suo reame concedutogli  
 per la ecclesia. Brevemente gli rispose  
 el dicto misser Alardo che non era 5  
 disposto ad farlo ne obedirlo, perche  
 non era tenuto et voleva compire el  
 suo viaggio. Vedendo el re Carlo che da  
 lui non poteva haver suo intento,] si'l  
 comandò et ricierchè da parte dil re di 10  
 Fransa suo fradel et per ll'onore di fian-  
 cieschi che'l dovesse agiutare et con-  
 sigliare contro al suo inimico et che  
 esso non volia uscir da suo consiglio.  
 Il decto missere Alardo gli rispuose, 15  
 Po ch'io vedo che vuy m'avete richiest  
 da parte di mon signiore re di Fransa  
 et anche per honor di fiancieschi, son  
 disposto hobedire, vero non per vostro  
 amore et si voglio una promission da 20  
 vuy, che non deviati uscire dall'ordene  
 il quale yo darro nella bactaglia contro  
 a vostro nemigho. Et cossi gli fo pro-  
 messo per re Karlo.

Brevemente il vecchy Alardo si 25  
 andò chol re Karlo incontro a Cor-  
 radino per fi al luogho decto in vol-  
 gare la Scolcola et si ordinò tre bac-  
 taglie ischierate. Et ad ogni bactaglia  
 si vestì un kavalieri all'arme di Fransa, 30  
 cio è ala fior de.llisa. Et ala terza bac-  
 taglia puose la persona di re Karlo  
 chol quali era il decto misser Alardo.  
 La qual terza bactaglia era riposta in  
 un luogho alquanto eminente et piu 35  
 nascosto da non poderono aver vista  
 di essi lor nemigi. Finalmente ordi-  
 nate le schiere fo principiata la prima  
 bactaglia. Et per vigor di Corradino  
 et di soa gente si fo isconficta. Et 40  
 di la seconda bactaglia anche fo vin-  
 ciedor Corradino, vero chon grande  
 occzision di gente dall'una parte et

**B** 16 vuy] *om. E* 21 uscire] *om. E* 27-28 in volgare ... Scolcola] ischierate la Scorcora *E*  
 30 vestì] ordinò

A

et sconfisseli et prese li predicti  
 Corradino, duca de Osterlich,  
 dompno Herrico frate de lo re de Spa-  
 gnyia, et lo conte Gado de Pisa con  
 multi alamagni, spagnyoli, et ytaliani.  
 Et feceli portare presuni ad Napoli  
 dove ad peticione de li homine de lo  
 riame fece taglyare la testa ali predicti  
 Corradino, duca de Osterlich, conte  
 Gado de Pisa, et alcuni altri in poco  
 numero. Lo predicto dompno Herrico  
 frate de lo re de Spagnya fo posto in  
 presone alo Castello de lo Monte de  
 Sancta Maria de Terra de Bari.

dall'altra. Per la qual chuosa Corra- B  
 dino et soa gente credendo in tucto  
 aver vincioto et non avendo noticia  
 di la terza bactaglia dil re Karlo, tucti  
 se disarmaron et stavano in gran leti- 5  
 cia et tranquillitade pigliando alchun  
 difrescamento et ispazzo di tempo per  
 riposo. Misser Alardo videndo che i  
 nemigi erano disarmadi et quasi istan-  
 chi per ll'affanno ricievoto nella bac- 10  
 taglia, sobito senza altra riscistensa gli  
 die adosso chon tucta soa gente dimo-  
 strando in tucto lor podere. Per la  
 qual chuosa i nemigi videndosi chosi  
 isprovodoti da non poder fare alchuna 15  
 difensione, fuoron percossi. Et per  
 vigor dil decto Alardo il vecchio quasi  
 tucti fuoron occziesi et pigliati et puo-  
 sti in isconficta. Corradino videndose  
 a tal partito, si sse salvò chon molti 20  
 altri signiori ala cita d'Asturi.

Et segueti dal re Karlo, il decto  
 Karlo avendo tractato chon misser  
 Pietro Freyapane il quali era signior  
 d'Asturi per cierti dinari chëbbe da 25  
 re Karlo, si gli li die per pregioni in  
 soe mano. El decto re Karlo gli portò  
 in Napoli et per prociesso si fo dica-  
 pitato Corradino, il duca di Sterlich,  
 e conte Gado di Pisa nel mercato di 30  
 Napoli dove mo sta la colopna inansi  
 al Carmino, il quale fo hedificado per  
 la madre dil decto Corradino dopo la  
 soa morte. Avuta la victoria, re Karlo  
 si fe chiamare misser Alardo et molto 35  
 ringraziòllo, diciendogli che per luy  
 et soa virtu si igliera stato vinciedore  
 et per luy repotava esser signiore dil  
 ryame. Et donògli il contado o ver  
 ducuto d'Amalfi et Sorrento chon suo 40  
 distrecto, pregandolo che no gli ispa-

A 25 conte] de *add. M1* || Gado] Guido *SN1*, Galdo *P3* 31 Gado] Guido *SN1*, Galdo *P3* ||  
 de Pisa] *om. P2* 34 de lo Monte] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3* 35 Bari] Lavore *GC*

B 11 sobito] salto fuor *E* 17 vigor] virtu *E* 22 decto] re *add. E* 24 Pietro] *om. E*  
 27 portò] mandò *E* 30 Gado] Guido *E* 38 signiore] vincitor *E*

A

resse. Il decto misser Alardo gli fe que- B  
 sta risposta: Ie non vol di vovre robe,  
 che quel ch'io o facto si ll'o facto per  
 amor di mon signior re di Fransa et  
 non per vostro amore. Et non volse 5  
 pigliar niente et puosese in mare et fe  
 suo viaggio. Partito misser Alardo, pen-  
 sando re Karlo ala victoria avuta et per  
 memoria di la qual victoria, si fe hedi-  
 ficare ad honore et laode de la ver- 10  
 gene Maria un monastero di monaci  
 dill'ordene di sancto Benedicto et si gli  
 arricchò et dotò di molti renditi. Al  
 quale per statuto non si ponno fare  
 monaci si no huomi di Fransa. Et prin- 15  
 cipiò hedificare il Castello Nuovo in  
 un luogo dovi era un monastero di rili-  
 giosi frati minori, et per quel luogo che  
 guastò per fare il castello, per cambio  
 di quello si fe il monastero di Sancta 20  
 Maria di la Nova.

69

*Charles was a great knight who went  
 on crusade with Saint Louis, fought off  
 ten attackers in the battle with Man- 25  
 fred, and led his army to victory against  
 Conradin. Then he gathered an army to  
 conquer Byzantium but was foiled by  
 the rebellion of Sicily. Charles created  
 four counts during his reign. 30*

Fo lo re Carlo primo cavaliere multo  
 strenuo, ardito, et virtuoso, et portause  
 ala guerra de lo passaggio de oltramare  
 dove fo con sancto Luyse re de Francza  
 suo frate multo meglyo che nullo altro, 35  
 et usavance grande prodecza da sua  
 persone. Ancora in de la bactaglya che

A 22 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 31 Fo] Poi GC 32 portause] multo bene se portao *N1, SN2, P3* 35 multo ... altro] et migliore se portò che tucti li altri *N1, SN2, P3* 36 grande] grandissima GC || prodecza] prudencia *SN1, GC*

B 3 io o facto] ge ai ferh E || facto] ferh E 15 di Fransa] francesi E 18 per] *om. E*

A fece colo re Manfreda se portao tanto valentemente che dove li foro adosso X cavaliere de li miglyure de la hoste che aveano iurata la sua morte, se defese in tale maniera che non appe dampno et li cavaliere foro morti et prese. Lo caporale de li sopradicti cavaliere fo missere Velardo Castagnya. Appresso ala bactaglya che fece Corradino per sua bona capitania et baccillaria de sua persona habe victoria de li suoy inimici.

Ancora fo lo predicto re homo de grande core, et poy che habe conquistato lo riame fece fare grande appresto de navilie et de cavallaria et de forragio per andare personalmente per conquistare Romania. Et fora stato facto se non che lo impedìo lu rebellion de Cicilia. Loquale rebellion non fo facta per colpa de lo re ma per colpa de li soy collaterani li quali indebitamente yspossemano li barune de lo riame de.loro terre et feceanole donare a.loro, eciamdio per colpa de li ufficiali li quali indebitamente et per multe vie gravano li homine de lo riame.

B  
5  
10  
15  
20  
25  
30  
Il quale Karlo ebbe gli animo tanto grande che dopo ch'èbe acquistato il ryame di Scicilia, si congregò una gran compagnia di kavalieri et navilii et una gran copia di forragio per acquistare il regno di Roma chol suo imperio. La qual chuosa gli fora forsi con felicità soccieso se non forsi per la ribellione di Scicilia. La qual ribellione fo principiata prey mali colleterali suoy i quay agravavano indebitamente i populi. Di la qual ribellione fo cagione et principale hordinadore misser Giovanni di Procida di Salerno il qual era stato medico di re Monfredo. Il quale andò per imbasciadore in Ragona al re Pietro di Raghona marito di madamma Ghostansa figliuola dil decto re Monfredo da parte di li signiori di Sicilia sollicitando il decto re che venisse ala

A 1 colo] *om. P1, F, P2* || tanto] tanto *add. GC* 2 dove] *om. F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3* 4 iurata] intrata *GC* 8 missere] con *GC* || Velardo] Gilardo *P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3, Berardo SN1* 8–13 Appresso ... Ancora] *om. SN1* 9 fece] con *add. SN2* || Corradino] ordinò *P2* 11 habe] *om. P1* 13 re] Carlo *add. SN1* 14–15 conquistato] acquistato *N1, GC, SN2, P3*, consequito *SN1* 15 fare] *om. N1, SN2, P3* 15–16 appresto] apparecchio *F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 16 cavallaria] cavaleri *GC* 17 forragio] ferraio *GC* 18 conquistare] acquistare *GC, SN2, P3* || fora stato] foriali venuto *N1, SN2, P3* 19 impedìo (*N1*)] imperiò *M1, P1*, inperatore *GC* 21 fo (*P1*)] *om. M1, GC* 21–22 de lo ... colpa] *om. P1* 21 lo re] loro *P2* 22 soy] cavaleri et *add. GC* 23 indebitamente] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || yspossemano] possedeano *SN1*, spodeano *P3* 24–25 et ... a.loro] *om. SN1* 24 feceanole] fece a nolle *P1, N1* 25 donare] dare *GC* 27 gravano] agravavano *F, N1, P2, SN2, P3*, grivandone *GC*

B 13 tanto] tutto *E* 14 acquistato] tutto *add. E* 16 kavalieri et] una gran copia de *add. E* 16–17 una gran copia] *om. E* 20 se (*E*)] *om. PL* 21 di Scicilia ... ribellione] *om. E* 29 di Raghona] *om. E* 30 re] *om. E* 31 da] *om. E* || di Sicilia] *om. E*



A

Lo sopradicto re Carlo in de lo tempo de la signyoria sua fece indeloriame quactro conti, cio è: missere Gualtiere conte de Brenda conte de Licza; missere Rogiere de Sancto Severino conte de Marsico; missere Pietro Ruffo conte de Catanzano; missere Berteraymo de lo Bauczo conte de Avellino.

70

*The islanders of Sicily rebelled and asked Peter of Aragon, who was married to Manfred's daughter, to be their lord. The rebellion was organized by Giovanni di Procida.*

Alo tempo de lo sopradicto re Carlo la insula de Cicilia se rebellao et chymao ad signyore lo re Piero de Rahona che era marito de madompna Gostanza che era stata figlya de lo sopradicto re Manfreda. Lo capo de la ordinacione de la predicta rebellione fo missere Ianne de Procida.

71

*Charles I was succeeded by Charles II who ruled 24 years and died in Naples. He was buried in San Domenico. Then his body was moved to Notre Dame de Nazareth in Aix.*

dicta insola di Scicilia promictengodogli il dominio di la dicta insola di Scicilia.

Il re Karlo fe homini in dil dominio suo. Et inter gli altri fe quactro conti, 5 cio è, missere Gahotieri conte di Brendisi et di Lecza, missere Rogieri San Severino conte di Marsico il quale fo valente huomo di soa persona, missere Pietro Ruffo conte di Catansano, 10 missere Berteraymo dil Balso conte di Avellino.

15

20

25

91

*Charles I was succeeded by Charles II, who was lame but wise, virtuous, and generous. He built Notre Dame de 30 Nazareth in Aix, S. Pietro a Castello in Naples, and S. Luigi in Aversa.*

A 6 cio è] cio fo N1, cio foro SN2, P3 6-8 missere ... Licza] om. P2 7 Brenda] Brendisi et F, N1, SN1, SN2, P3 10 Ruffo (P3)] Russo P1, M1, N1, SN1, GC, Ruscio F, P2 11 Berteraymo] Barthomeo o Berteramo SN1 13 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3 21 signyore] signyo P3 23 stata] om. N1 24 re] om. P1 25 ordinacione ... predicta] rebellione et della N1, om. SN2, P3 26 Procida] medico qui dominium Salerni tenebat add. P2 27 tit. add. N1, SN2, P3

B 1-3 promictengodogli ... Scicilia] om. E 6-7 Brendisi] Brenda E

A A lo predicto re Carlo primo succese in de lo signyoria lo re Carlo secundo lu quale visse in de la signyoria anni XXIII et moriò ad Napoli in de lo anno de la dominica incarnatione Mille CCC VIII lo iorno de sabato, lu quale fo lo V iorno de lo mese de mayo de la VII ind. Fo sepellito in de la ecclesia de Sancto Dominico lu quale è dell'ordene de li frati predicaturi in de lo anno de la etate sua LX. Et da poy ne fo portato lo corpo suo ad Aquis in Provenza et foy sepellito a lo monasterio de Sancta Maria de Nazareth dell'ordene de le sore predecatrice.

Al quale re Karlo primo socciese al B ryame Karlo sicundo suo primogenito et unicho figlio. Il quale fo storto di corpo ma dricto di mente, savio et pieno di virtute infinite. In dil tempo 5 dil qual re Karlo non se.nde trovò niuno piu largo in duoni ni piu magnifico im private helemosine. Fo glorioso in pace et in brighe. Luy fe hedificare ad Aix cita di Provenza un 10 monastero di frati riligiosi et monaci, il quale se chyama Sancta Maria di Nazareth. Et in Napoli fe hedificare il monastero di Sancto Pietro a Castello di simile ordine, et ad Averse il mona- 15 stero di Sancto Loygi di gli ordine di predicatori, il quale dotò et arricchì di gran ricchicze.

72

*Charles II had nine sons and five daughters by his wife Maria of Hungary.*

Lo sopradicto re Carlo habe figlyoli XIII de li quali ne foro masculi nove et femene V. De li masculi fo lo primo nato missere Carlo Martello lo quale era chyamato re de Ungaria. Lo secundo fo sancto Luyse de Franca. Lo terczo fo lo re Ruberto. Lo quarto fo missere Philippo principe de Taranto. Lo quinto fo missere Raymundo Berlangiere. Lo sexto fo missere Thomasi lo quale fo clerico et moriò piczulo infanto. Lo septimo

92

*Charles II was married to Maria, 20 heiress to the kingdom of Hungary. They had nine sons and five daughters.*

Hebbe il decto re Karlo sighondo per moglie Maria figliola primogenita dill'inclito re d'Ungaria, la qual 25 socciese al regnio d'Ungaria dopo la morte dil padre et fo chyamata regina d'Ungaria. Di la quale il decto Karlo ebbe nove figliuoli mascholi et cinque femine. Cio è: Karlo Martello 30 primogenito il quale fo intitolato re d'Ungaria. Lodovico il quale per virtù di Dio et di soe bone operazioni fo sancto. Roberto re di Scicilia. Misser

A 5-6 de la ... incarnatione] domini SN<sub>1</sub> 6 VIII] VIII P<sub>3</sub> || iorno] di SN<sub>1</sub> 7 lu ... lo] ali SN<sub>1</sub> 7-8 de lo ... mayo] om. SN<sub>1</sub> 8 VII] settimana P<sub>3</sub> 9-10 lu ... ordene] om. SN<sub>1</sub> 10 frati] om. GC 13 Aquis] Aquio P<sub>3</sub> 13-14 lo monasterio de] om. P<sub>2</sub> 15 sore predecatrice] predicaturi GC 19 cap. 71 et 72 uniti SN<sub>1</sub>, tit. add. N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 27-28 Ungaria] Bungaria P<sub>2</sub> 28 secundo] nato add. P<sub>1</sub>, F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || fo] om. SN<sub>1</sub> 30 Philippo] Roberto Filippo SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 31 fo] om. P<sub>1</sub> 34 infanto] om. GC

B 1-2 al ryame] el dominio del reame E 7 niuno] alcuno E 7-8 in duoni ... magnifico] ne domino piu magno E 9 Luy] om. E 15 simile (E)] illeg. PL 18 gran] molte E 28 Karlo] re secundo E

- A fo missere Tristano che nassèò quando lo patre era presone et moriò iovene infante. Lo octavo fo missere Ianne principe de la Morea. Lo nono foy missere Pietro conte de Gravina. De le V figlyole femene la prima nata fo madamma Clemenza laquale fo moglyere de messere Carlo lo patre de re Filippo de Francza che ène mo. La secunda se chyamao madamma Byancha et fo moglyere de lo re Iacobo de Rahona. La tercza se chyamao madamma Alienora et foy moglyere de dopn Federico lu quale se faceva chyamare re de Cicilia. La quarta se chyamao madamma Maria che fo moglyere de lo re de Maiorica. La quinta se chyamao madamma Viatrice laquale fo moglyere primaramente de lo marchese de Ferrara et da poy de lo conte Scagiuso. Tucti li sopradicti figli et figlye habe lo sopradicto re de madamma la regina Maria figlye de lo re de Ungaria soa muglyere.
- Philippo prinziepe di Tharanto. Misser Ramondo Berllingieri rigiente di la Vicaria dil ryame. Misser Giovanni il quale fo chierico et morto piczolo infante di diece anni. Misser Tristano il quale fo nato in tristicia, che suo patre era in pregione a Raghona in quel tempo, che fo pigliato dal re di Rahona in bactaglia di navilii ad un luogho presso di Napoli il qual se chyama il Capo d'Ansi. Il qual misser Tristano finiò la soa vita in dell'anno septimo di la soa eta. Misser Giovanni prinzepe di Acaya et successive duca di Durazo. Misser Pietro conte di Gravina il qual morì molto giovene. Le figliuole fuoron cinque, cio è: madama Clemensa laqual fo moglie di misser Karlo primogenito dil re di Fransa il qual fo chyamado re Philippo li bello. Madama Bianca moglie dil re di Roghona. Madamma Elinora moglie dil signior di Trinacria il quale se chiamò Federico di Raghona. Madama Maria moglie dil re di Mayorica. Madamma Viatrice primo moglie dil marchese di Ferrara. La seconda volta fo moglie di misser Bertheraymo dil Balso conte di Monte Scagioso di la qual nasciò madamma [...]; la terza volta fo data per moglie a misser Uberto dalfino di Vienna.

A 3 fo] *om. P2* || Ianne] el quali fo *add. GC* 5 Gravina] Granoro *GC* 6 V] *om. SN2, P3* || figlyole] *om. GC* || nata] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 8 patre] che fo *add. SN1* 9 che ... mo] *om. N1, F, P2, SN1, SN2, P3* 11 Iacobo] Jaymo *SN1* 13 madamma] *om. GC* 16 se chyamao] fo chiamata *F, P2, SN2, P3* 17 Maiorica] Maglolica *N1*, Marica *P2* 19 primaramente] de prima volta *SN1*, prima *SN2, P3* 20 Ferrara] Monferrara *SN1* || de] habe *GC* 21 conte] de Monte *add. SN1* 22 figli (*P1*)] figlye *M1* || lo sopradicto re] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 23 madamma ... Maria] Magorama la regina *GC* 24 soa muglyere] *om. SN1*

B 13 septimo] IIII *E* || eta] vita *E* 14-15 successive] per successione *E* 32 Uberto] Roberto *E*

73

A *Charles II was just, generous, and much loved by his vassals. He built many churches, rewarded his subjects with fiefs and honors, and improved Naples. He created six counts.*

Fo lo re Carlo secundo iusto, graciuso, liberale, benigno, et multo amato da li vassalli. Fo eciamdio fidelissimo xpiano et augmentao lo cultu divino et fece in suo tempo multe ecclesie, monasterii, et hospitali. Et benificao li homine de lo riame donando a.llo contati, baronie, et honuri, et benificao eciamdio la citate de Napoli in generalitate et specialemente. Et fecene cardinali, miragly, conti et barune et grande officiali, et fece incomenzare lo molo, et conceseli la cabella de lo bono dinaro et multe et sancte gracie le quale serriano multo longo ad scrivere.

93

B *Charles II was so just he punished his own errant judges, and was generous and much loved. He gave great honors and titles to his loyal men, and improved Naples. He created six counts and raised up the Sigimulfo brothers of Naples. He ruled 24 years and died in Naples. He was buried in San Domenico, and his body was later moved to S. Maria of Nazareth in Provence.*

Fo etiamdio il decto Karlo chomo è decto giusto chosi perfectamente chomo se bisognava et fo necessario, impero che spisso poniva et giudicava i giudici i quay avia puosti a giudicare altruy. Et luy fe et ordinò i giudici dele inquisicioni. Fo glorioso, benigno, liberale, et molto amabile. Et quello al quale poneva amore may in soa vita no gli abandonava per altri decti pur che fosse liale. Et impero esso ragionevelemente prey soy meriti fo amato da tucti, impero che alcuni di suo seguaci et servidori fe pervenire all'alteca di cardinali, et alchuni a titolo di contado, et alchuni a baronie, et alchuni ad altri grandi officii et honori. Et egli incominsò a magnificare la cita di Napoli et fevi hedificare il molo, et remise la colta ay citadini, et fe la gabella dil buon dinayo la qual fo molto grata ay napolitani.

A 1 *tit. add.* N1, SN2, P3 13 re] sopradicto SN1 16 augmentao] multo *add.* SN1 18 monasterii] maiuri P1, F, P2, *om.* N1, SN2, P3 || benificao] magnificao seu benificò P1, magnificò F, N1, P2, SN1, SN2, P3 19 donando] dando SN2, P3 20 baronie] barune GC || honuri] homini P2, SN2, P3 || benificao] fe beneficio a N1, SN2, P3, magnificò SN1 21 eciamdio] *om.* P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 21–22 generalitate] genere SN1 22 specialemente] specialitate N1, P2, SN2, P3, specie SN1 || et fecene (N1)] et feceli M1, P1, GC, facendo li SN1 22–24 cardinali ... fece] *om.* P2 24 incomenzare] luy *add.* N1, SN2, P3 25 molo] umolo F, vinulo P1, GC 26 sancte] grande F, N1, P2, SN2, P3 27 multo] *om.* F, N1, P2, SN2, P3

B 13 Fo (E)] Po PL 14 giusto chosi] homo iusto E 18 altruy] alcuni E 21–22 in soa vita] *om.* E 24 esso ragionevelemente] poi E

- A** Lo predicto re dede per muglyere ad missere Romano deli Ursini la contessa de Nola et intitulaolo conte de Nola. Simelemente dede per muglyere ad missere Goffreda Gaytano, dede ali niputi de lo papa Bonifacio la contessa de Fundi et intitulaolo conte de Fundi. Fece missere Ermengao de Sabramo provenczale conte de Ariano; missere Berteraymo de lo Bauczo conte de Monte Scagiuso; et fece missere Riczardo de Claramonte fecelo conte de Claramonte; et missere Ianne de Monforte conte de Monforte.
- Et magnificao.nde assay di moglie et d'altri honori, et primo misser Romano Ursino al quale die per moglie madama [...] contessa di Nola et luy intitolò conte di Nola; misser Goffredo Gaytano d'Alagnio nipote di la gloriosa memoria papa Bonifacio, al qual die per moglie madama [...] contessa di Fondi et fello conte di Fondi. Simelmente misser Hermingaudo di Sabrano fe conte d'Ariano, Berteraymo dil Balso conte di Monte Scagiuso, Ricziardo di Chiarmonte conte di Monte Chiarmonte, misser Giovanni di Monforte conte di Monforte. Di chiari et altissimi honori si magnificò i nobili et extrenui kavalieri misser Roberto et misser Bartholomeo Siconolfi frati et cittadini di Napoli, i quay l'uno si honorò all'officio d'esser conte camorlingho e gli altro all'officio dil miragliado. Questo Karlo sighondo visse in dil dominio anni XXVIII et fo morto in Napoli in dill'anno domini M CCC VIII ay cinque di di magio di la VII ind., nel di di sabato. Et fo sepolito nella cchiesa di San Domeneco dill'ordine di predicadori, et fo di eta di anni LX. El corpo suo dopo fo portato in Provensa et posto al decto monastero di Santa Maria di Nazareth.

**A** 1 re] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 2 ad] *om. P1* || Romano] Ramundo *P2* 3-4 et intitulaolo ... Nola] *om. F, P2* 4 dede] dele *GC* || per] *om. N1, GC, SN2, P3* 5 Dede ali] *om. SN1* 6 lo] mixere *F, N1, SN2, P3* || Bonifacio] octavo *add. SN1* 7 et ... Fundi] *om. N1, GC* 8 de Sabramo] *om. GC* 10-11 conte de Monte Scagiuso] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 11 missere] *om. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 12 fecelo] *om. F, SN1, SN2, P3* 12-13 fecelo ... Claramonte] *om. N1, P2, GC* 14 Monforte] Morte *P3*

**B** 1 magnificao.nde] magnificando *E* 6 Goffredo] Gioesei *E* || d'Alagnio] d'Alagrio *E* 11 d'Ariano] de Atrano *E* 13 Chiarmonte] Darmonte *E* 14 Chiarmonte] Darmonte *E* 19-21 si honorò ... camorlingho] *om. E* 25 di] *om. E*

74

A *Charles II was succeeded by Robert, who ruled 33 years, died in Naples, and was buried in S. Chiara.*

Alo quale re Carlo secundo succese lo re Ruberto et visse in de lo dominio anni XXXIII et mise VIII et iorni XV. Lo quale moriò ad Napoli et foy sepelito in de la ecclesia de Sancta Chyara de Napoli all'ordene de le sore menure in de lo anno de la dominica incarnatione Mille CCC XXXXIII de lo iorno de dominica de la XI ind. in de lo anno de la etate sua LXVIII.

94

Charles II was succeeded by Robert, B who was strong in battle and very learned. He subdued Genoa and protected the realm from imperial invasion, sending his son Charles to Florence to fight the German tyrant Ludwig of Bavaria. His death was a blow to the kingdom and to the memory of Andrew of Hungary, who was married to Queen Joanna, Robert's granddaughter. Robert was very pious, composed sermons and listened to preachers. His wife Sancia built many monasteries. He built other structures in Naples and created many counts.

Al quale re Karlo sighondo socciese in del dominio et ghovernacion dil regnio Roberto suo figliuolo terzogenito, huomo extrenuo di cavallaria et gran sciensa dal principio di la soa gioventu.

A 1 *cap. 73 et 74 uniti SN1, tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 17 secundo] *om. SN1* || succese] *repet. M1* 19 XXXIII] XXIII *SN1* || iorni] di *N1, P2, SN2, P3* 20 ad] *repet. M1* 21 de Sancta] *om. P1* 22 all'ordene ... menure] *om. SN1* || menure] *monache F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 23-24 de la ... incarnatione] domini *SN1* 24 XXXXIII] XLIII *N1, SN2, P3* 26 LXVIII] XLVIII *N1*

B 17 Al (E)] El *PL* || re] *om. E* 18 ghovernacion] generatione *E* 20 extrenuo] extremo *E*

A *Robert was the wisest man since Solomon. He was strong in battle and protected the realm from imperial invasion. He built many churches and other structures, promoted piety, and increased the income of the realm. He created many counts. He was succeeded by his granddaughter Joanna, daughter of his son Charles, who is the wife of our lord Louis.* B

Fo lo re Ruberto lo pyu savio homo in sapiencia che fosse in terra da lo tempo de Salamone. Fo strenuissimo in arme de la sua iuventute et mostròlo tanto in de lo riame quanto in Cicilia, Toscana, Genua. Et dove fo invaduto lo riame per inpressuri de imperaturi si se reparao in tale manera che illo conservao senza dampno.

La qual virtu et soa magnianimita si mostrò in Scicilia et in Toschana in di la sobgiogacion di Gienova cita potente et nobile. In di la quale com- 15  
bactendo a pie per le vie et car-  
rere choy suo napolitani si acquistò  
la dicta cita cavallareschamente per  
forsa d'arme et tennela luongo tempo,  
ponendovi gli officiali et faciendovi 20  
ministrar ragione et giosticia. Mostrò  
la soa virilita e'l suo bien aoprare in dil  
tempo che fo imbadito dagl'impera-  
dore Herrigho di Bohemia che venne  
contro al ryame di Scicilia. El decto 25  
re Roberto se trovò sagacientemente pro-  
veduto. Fo anche una gran parte di  
soa virtu manifestata quando mandò  
Karlo suo primogenito, il quali era  
duca di Calabri, chon grande compa- 30  
gnia di gente d'arme a Fierensa con-  
tro al duca di Baviera, il quali era  
venuto chon gran potensa di tode-  
schi et tirampni per volere occu-  
pare il ryame di Scicilia. Intanto che'l 35  
decto duca di Baviera quali era venuto  
per fi a Roma, operante la virtu dil  
decto re Roberto non puocte passare,

A 1 *tit. add. N1, SN2, P3* 13 *sapiencia*] *siencia SN1* 13-14 *in terra ... Salamone*] *al mundo da Salamone in cqua SN1* 15 *arme*] *ne lo tempo add. N1, SN2, P3* || *mostròlo*] *monstrandolo GC* 17 *dove*] *dovunca N1, SN2, P3* 18 *de (N1)] om. P1, M1, SN1, GC* 19-20 *in tale ... conservao*] *in tale manera che se conservao add. N1* 19 *illo*] *se E, N1, P2, SN2, P3* 20 *dampno*] *lo reame add. SN1*

B 14 *Gienova*] *la mia cita E* 22 *virilita*] *virtu E* 23 *imbadito*] *isbandito E* 24 *Bohemia*] *Suavia E*

A

Fece fare in suo tempo multe ecclesie inter laquale fo facta la ecclesia de Sancta Chyara in Napoli et fece fare lo Castello de Sancto Heramo et la capella laquale è indelo Castello Novo eccellentemente penta, et lo tarcenali de Napoli, et augmentao lo cultu divino multo in suo tempo. Et augmentao multo li renditi et le gabelle de lo riamo et nobilitao lo riame fando li infrascripti conti et officiali, vz.:

ma gli bisognò di tornarse indietro, B  
 costrecto a dover fogiere. El suo regnio  
 rimanecte in pace et stato tranquillo, et  
 chosi permase et durò in fine al tempo  
 che luy signiorigiò et per fi ala dapna- 5  
 bile et crodele morte, dapnosa a tucto'l  
 ryame et distrogietiva di la alta et bona  
 memoria dil re Andrea figliuol di mis-  
 ser Karlo re d'Ungaria, il quale fo dato  
 per marito ala sacratissima dompna 10  
 madama la regina Iohanna, nipode dil  
 decto re Roberto. Di i quay marito  
 et moglie inansi farremo mensione.  
 Fo anche il re Roberto humo catho-  
 lico et pietoso, il quale molto frequen- 15  
 tava et vigitava le cchiese et gli offi-  
 cii divini et molto aumentò il colto  
 divino faciendo et componendo ser-  
 moni per la soa sciensa la quale avia.  
 Era sollicito di odire le prediche et 20  
 ogni paruola di i facti di Dio.

Eciamdio, Dio operante et sol-  
 llicitante, fe hedificare la inclita et  
 catholica dompna madamma Sansia  
 di Magiorica regina et soa moglie i 25  
 soscrepti monasteri, cio è: il nobil  
 monastero dil Santo Corpo di Xpo di  
 gli ordine di santa Chiara. Il mona-  
 stero di Santa Maria Egipciaca, il  
 monastero di Santa Crocie di Napoli 30  
 chon convento di frati minori et di rili-  
 giose monache. I quay frati et mona-  
 che pre i renditi et borgensatichi bona  
 vita conducieno. Et fe fare un'altro  
 monastero di quesso ordine il qual 35  
 se chiama puro Santa Chiara ala cita  
 di Acx im Provensa. Fe fare anche  
 un'altro monastero in Jerusalem il qual  
 se chiama Santa Maria di Monte Scion.

A 23 fo facta] fe fare *N1, GC, SN2, P3*, fo *SN1* 27 penta] perita *SN1* 27-28 tarcenali] arzelano *P2*, teranale *GC* 28 lo cultu] *om. P1, F, P2*, lo *SN2, P3* 29 multo] *om. N1* || in ... tempo] *om. GC* 30 multo] *om. P1, F, N1, P2, SN2, P3* || gabelle] et renditi *add. GC* 31 riamo et] multo *add. GC* || et nobilitao ... riame] *om. P1* || fando] secundo *GC* 32 vz.] zo foro *N1, SN2, P3*

B 1 bisognò] convenne *E* 6 et crodele] *om. E* 10 marito (*E*)] *illeg. PL* 22 Dio] *om. E* 31 chon convento] de l'ordine *E* 37 Fe fare] *om. E*



A

missere Thomasi de Marzano conte de Squillaci; missere Diago de la Racta catalano conte de Caserta; missere Nicola de Ianvilla conte de Sancto Angelo; missere Iordano Ruffo conte de Monte Alto; missere Guilielmo Ruffo conte de Synopoli; missere Philippo de Sanginito conte de Altomonte; missere Rogiere de Sancto Severino conte de Milito; missere Ianne de Corliano conte de Corliano; missere Nicola de Ianvilla intitolato fo conte de Terra Nova la quale era de sua moglyere;

Al quale monastero di Santa Crocie di Napoli è sepellito il corpo di la dicta regina Sansia. Anche fe fare maggiore et crescere gli hedificii dil Castel Nuovo, et fevi hedificare et pengiere una cap- 5  
pella la quale è forse la piu bella che sia ogi nel mondo per remission di i peccati dil decto suo figliuolo duca di Calabria. Fe anche hedificare il Castello di Sancto Heramo. Et in dil 10  
suo dominio meritò et fe molti signiori in grandi officii et signorie. Videlicet imprimis:  
Misser Thomaso di Marsano conte di Squillaci 15  
Misser Degho cathalano conte di Caserta  
Misser Nicholo di Ianvilla conte di Sant'Angelo  
Misser Giordano Ruffo conte di 20  
Montalto  
Misser Guilielmo Ruffo conte di Sinopoli  
Misser Philippo di Sanginico conte d'Altomonte 25  
Misser Rogieri San Severino conte di Melito  
Misser Giovanni di Corogliano conte di Corogliano  
Misser Nicholo di Ianvilla il piu 30  
intimo amico fo intitolato conte di Terra Nova per parte di madamma Margarita di Laoria soa moglie.  
Al quale contato po la morte di la predicta madamma Margarita 35  
socciese il predicto conte di Melito suo nipote carnale et intitolosse conte di Melito et di Terra Nova.

A 15–16 missere Diago ... Caserta] *pos. post* “Angelo” P2 16 catalano] el quali fo catalano GC 18 Ruffo (P3)] Russo P1, M1, F, SN1, GC, Russo N1, Rossio P2 18–20 conte de Monte ... Ruffo] *om.* SN1 20 Ruffo (P3)] Russo P1, M1, GC, Ruscio N1, Ruscio F, P2 21 Sanginito] Sannito SN1, Sanguino SN2, P3 25 intitolato fo] intitulao N1, SN2, intitolato F, P2, P3, *om.* SN1 26 era] èvi N1

B 3–4 fe ... crescere (E)] *illeg.* PL 10 Heramo] *om.* E 12–13 Videlicet imprimis] et primo E 20 Ruffo (E)] Rosso PL 22 Ruffo (E)] Rosso PL 37–38 suo nipote ... Melito] *om.* E

<p>A messere Nicola Pipino conte de Menerbino; missere Gasso de Nisiaco conte de Trellicze; missere Belardo de Aquino conte de Lorito; missere Berardo de Acquaviva conte de Sancto Valentino; missere Riczardo de lo Brosone conte de Satriano; missere Roberto de Capua conte de Altavilla; missere Roberto Visconte conte de Mirabello; missere Pietro Pipino conte de Vico; missere Nicola de Ebuli de Capua conte de Triveno; missere Pietro Salva Cossa conte de Bellante; missere Thomasi de Aquino conte de Bello Castro.</p>	<p>Misser Nicholo Pipino conte di Minorbino</p> <p>Misser Gasso di Sidiniaco conte di Terlicchie</p> <p>Misser Berardo d'Aquino conte di Lo[r]ito 5</p> <p>Misser Corrado d'Acquaviva conte di San [Benedetto]</p> <p>Misser Ricziardo dil Brosson conte di Satriano 10</p> <p>Misser Roberto di Capua conte d'Alta[villa]</p> <p>Misser Roberto visconte conte di Mira[bello]</p> <p>Misser Pietro Pipino conte di Vico. 15</p> <p>Misser Nicolo di Eboli di Capoa conte di Tr[ivento]</p> <p>Misser Pietro Salvacossa d'Ischa conte di Bell[ante]</p> <p>Misser Thomaso d'Aquino conte di Belcastro. 20</p>	<p><b>B</b></p>
---	---	-----------------

95

*Robert was succeeded by his granddaughter Joanna, daughter of his son Charles. She was the wife of Louis, the son of the prince of Taranto, who was crowned king by Pope Clement.* 25

---

A 1 Nicola] *om.* GC, de *add.* F, Cola de P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 1–2 Menerbino] Momurinno N<sub>1</sub>, Monoriuno SN<sub>1</sub> 2 Gasso] Saxo P<sub>2</sub>, Galasso SN<sub>1</sub> || de Nisiaco] de Ursiato SN<sub>1</sub>, fo facto *add.* GC, de Visiato SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 3 Belardo] Orlando GC 6–7 de lo Brosone] de Bruscio N<sub>1</sub>, *om.* GC, de Briscione SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 10–11 missere Pietro ... Vico] *om.* N<sub>1</sub> 11 Ebuli] Cubuli P<sub>2</sub> 11–12 de Capua] *om.* N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>1</sub>, GC, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 13–14 Bellante ... conte de] *om.* P<sub>3</sub> 14 Aquino] Aperio GC

B 5–8 conte di Lorito ... Benedetto] conte de San Benedetto E 6 Lorito (*ed. princ.*)] *mutil.* PL 8 Benedetto (E)] Valentino *ed. princ.* 10 Satriano (E)] S- [*mutil.*] PL 12 Altavilla (E)] *mutil.* PL 14 Mirabello (E)] *mutil.* PL 15 Pipino] *om.* E 16 Eboli] Eoch E 17 Trivento (E)] *mutil.* PL 18 d'Ischa] *om.* E 19 Bellante (E)] *mutil.* PL

A Alo quale re Ruberto succese la signyoria de nostra dompna la regina Iohanna nepote sua che fo figlya de missere Carlo duca de Calabria primogenito de lo predicto re Ruberto, la quale è moglyere de lo nostro signyore re Luyse.

Al quale re Roberto socciese in di la signioria la regina Johanna nipote soa laqual fo figliuola di Karlo duca di Calabria primogenito dil re Roberto. La qual regina Johanna fo moglie dil re Loygi il qual fo figliuolo dil prenze di Tharanto. Il quale re Loygi per parte di la predicta regina soa moglie fo coronato re dil ryame per papa Chyemento.

## 96B

*Joanna's first marriage, arranged by King Robert, was to Andrew of Hungary. He soon died an evil death, and to avenge him his brother, the king of Hungary, invaded the kingdom and did great damage.*

E primo che la predicta regina Johana fosse moglie dil predicto re Loygi si era stata moglie dil re Andrea, il quale re Andrea fo figliuolo dil re d'Ungaria. Et venne da Ungaria per ordinamento dil re Roberto, acioche po la morte dil re Roberto regniasse il predicto re Andrea. Il quale re Andrea visse puogo tempo per mala guardia che fe, et fo morto molto vitoperosamente. Per la qual vitoperosa morte venne in dil regnio armata manu il re d'Ongaria [suo fratello] Et fe molto dampno in dil ryame. Et [volendose dev]engiare di la morte di suo fradel si fe [tagliare il] capo al duca di

A 1 re] *om.* P<sub>1</sub>, F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> || succese] a *add.* M<sub>1</sub> 1-2 la signyoria ... la] la signoria de la dompna la P<sub>1</sub>, la singioria la dopna la F, la singnoria madamma la N<sub>1</sub>, in la segnoria madamma la P<sub>2</sub>, ala signoria la nostra SN<sub>1</sub>, alla singnoria la nostra dopna la GC, la signoria ala regina SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 3 Iohanna] prima *add.* SN<sub>1</sub> || sua] *om.* P<sub>1</sub>, F, N<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 4 Carlo] che fo *add.* GC 5 de lo ... Ruberto] *om.* SN<sub>1</sub> 5-6 la quale ... moglyere] lo quale è migliore P<sub>1</sub>, F, lo qualè non meglio N<sub>1</sub>, lo quale non fo meglio SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> 6 signyore] *om.* P<sub>2</sub>

B 1 Al] Il E || in] el dominio *add.* E 2 signioria] de *add.* E || nipote] *ivi concludit E* 20 stata (*ed. princ.*)] frata PL 30 suo fratello (*ed. princ.*)] *mutil.* PL 31-32 volendose devengiare (*ed. princ.*)] *mutil.* PL 33 tagliare il (*ed. princ.*)] *mutil.* PL

A

Doraczo in la cita d'Aversa [in quello B  
me]desmo luogo dove fo morto il re  
Andrea [suo fratello]. E nansi di la  
venuta dil predicto [re de] Ongaria  
per consentimento di gli conti [et de 5  
li bar]oni et di gli uomini citadini  
di Napoli ne [forono] facte grande et  
aspre vendecte di conti, [con]tesse et  
di baroni et altri huomini per la morte  
dil predicto re Andrea. 10

La sopradicta breve informacione  
tracta de diverse croniche ve fay a  
vuy nostro signore re Luyse lo vostro  
fidelissimo vassallo Bartholomeo Ca-  
razzulo dicto Carrafa cavaliere de  
Napoli. Deo gracias. Amen. 15

---

A 12 ve (*P1*)] che *M1*, le *F*, la *N1*, *P2*, *SN2*, *P3* 13 nostro] *om. F, N1, P2, SN2, P3*  
14 Bartholomeo] Bartholo *GC* 15 dicto Carrafa] *om. SN1* 16 Deo ... Amen] *om. N1,*  
*P2, SN1, SN2, P3*

B 1-2 in quello medesimo (*ed. princ.*)] *mutil. PL* 3 suo fratello (*ed. princ.*)] *mutil. PL* 4 re  
de (*ed. princ.*)] *mutil. PL* 5-6 et ... baroni (*ed. princ.*)] *mutil. PL* 7 forono (*ed. princ.*)]  
*mutil. PL* 8 contesse (*ed. princ.*)] *mutil. PL*



## APPENDICES



## appendix i

### HISTORICAL NOTES AND SOURCES

#### *Chapter 1*

As noted in Chapter Four, the source for this chapter may be the lost first folios of “Commentary V,” which survives now in the mutilated copy in Naples, Bib. Naz., IX C 24, fols. 89<sup>r</sup>–124<sup>v</sup>. Solon and Draco were lawgivers of ancient Greece, mentioned by a number of classical authors well known in the Middle Ages (Augustine, Valerius Maximus), though the *Cronaca*’s implication, that both were tyrannical and caused the Greeks who eventually settled the Bay of Naples to flee, is unusual. For a roughly contemporary work treating both lawgivers, see Ranulf Higden’s fourteenth-century *Polychronicon*, ed. Joseph Lumby, 9 vols. (London, 1865–1886; repr. 1964), at vol. 3, 96–98.

The latter part of this chapter is also echoed in “Commentary V” in its later entry on Cumae (fol. 119<sup>r-v</sup>): “Cumae cumarum civitas fuit olim in Campania que nunc Terre Laboris est post Bayas quam considerunt illi qui profecti sunt de Calcide civitate Euboeae .... Dicta est autem Cume ab augurio mulieris pregnantis que grece KOUNUS dicitur .... Cumani secundum Titum Livium 8 Ab urbe condita traxerunt originem a Calcidensibus. Fuerunt autem Calsidenses de quadam civitate Euboeae insule que Calcis dicta est. Nam inde navigando recedentes insulam Senaria, id est Capreas, et Pitecusas, id est Isclam et Prochitam; tenerunt deinde de insulis recedentes incontinentem terram venerunt et fecerunt Cumas.” The Livian passage on the Greeks’ origins need not come from this entry on Cumae, as it is also cited in “Commentary V” in its earlier entry on Naples (at fol. 90<sup>v</sup>: see below in the notes to chapter 8); the *Cronaca*’s quotation from Ovid is also lacking here, and derives ultimately from *Metamorphoses*, Book XIV, 90 (in the Loeb Classical Library edition, trans. Frank Justus Miller [Cambridge, MA, 1977], at 306).

The *Cronaca*’s reversal of the Greeks’ home city and province (which should be Calcis in the province of Euboea) may come from the telescoped descriptions in “Commentary V” (“erant oriundi cumani a



Calcide Euboyca,” fol. 90<sup>v</sup>) or careless reading of more specific descriptions (“de Calcide civitate Euboeae,” fol. 119<sup>v</sup>).

### Chapter 2

This chapter too was probably culled from the lost first folios of “Commentary V,” though it might also (or additionally) represent an expansion of the terser references to Daedalus and to the *Aeneid* VI: 1–19 in Commentary V’s entry on Cumae (fol. 119<sup>r-v</sup>). The most relevant citations from the Cumae entry are: “Ideo dicta est eoque condita sit ab illis qui venerunt de Calcide, unde Virgilius 6, ‘Dedalus ut fama est;’” “Item in 7 En[eide] ait qualis in Euboyco Bayarum lictore cond[idit?] saxea pela cadit Euboyco lictore id est cumano locus ubi Dedalus exiit alas. Civitas cumarum dicitur a Iuvenal. hac de cause Dedalus enim fugiens iram minois regis cretensis Cumas pervenit in quam remigium deposuit.” The *Cronaca*’s citation of Virgil’s *Aeneid* ultimately comes from Book VI, lines 1–19, here badly garbled and in a confused order (lines 14–17, 9–10, 18–19, 1–2). The original verses are as follows (cited from the Loeb edition of Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I–VI*, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough [Cambridge, MA, 1916; repr. 1994]):

Sic fatur lacrimans, classique immittit habenas (1)  
 et tandem Euboicis Cumarum adlabitur oris. ... (2)  
 at pius Aeneas arces quibus altus Apollo (9)  
 praesidet horrendaeque procul secreta Sibyllae .... (10)  
 Daedalus, ut fama est, fugiens Minoia regna (14)  
 praepetibus pennis ausus se credere caelo (15)  
 insuetum per iter gelidas enavit ad Arctos, (16)  
 Chalcidicaque leuis tandem super astitit arce. (17)  
 redditus his primum terris tibi, Phoebe, sacrauit (18)  
 remigium alarum posuitque immania templa. (19)

### Chapter 3

The *Cronaca*’s narrative here corresponds to the beginning of the surviving text of “Commentary V” at fol. 89<sup>r</sup>. The “corrupted lakes” identified as the cause of the pestilence are mentioned in “Commentary V” with regard to the second epidemic: see below under chapter 4. On their settlement at Parthenope, cf. “Commentary V,” at fol. 89<sup>r</sup>: “Cadaver cuiusdam mulieris que Parthenopes dicta est invenerunt. A cuius eventus nomine vocaverunt Parthenopen. Cum igitur civitas ipsa propter ubertatem loci

aerisque temperiem semper accresceret. Cumani ipsi Parthenopen venientes, ipsam totaliter diruerunt et coegerunt suos concives redire ad pristinam civitatem.”

Group B places the lines from Virgil's *Aeneid*, VI: 1–19 here rather than in chapter 2, without the introductory phrase found in Group A copies; it cites the Latin more accurately, albeit in the same confused order.

#### Chapter 4

Cf. “Commentary V” fol. 89<sup>r</sup>: “Post alicuius itaque metulum temporis cum cumani ipsi propter latus vicinos aquasque sulfureas ac putridas, epidimiam aliam et maximam incurrerunt, ad ydolum accesserunt, consulentes quid possent facere ut epydimia rebraque hominum mors tolleretur. Quibus ydolum respondisse narratur ut de Cumis recederent et Parthenopen adirent, eamque de novo reficerent. Parthenope de novo ante dirutam, Neapolim, hoc est novam civitatem, vocaverunt.” As noted in Chapter Four above, “Commentary V” here implies that Neapolis was founded on the same spot as Parthenope, which was now called the “new city” because the Cumaeans had abandoned it and then returned. The *Cronaca* gives a different account of Neapolis’ settlement and location in chapters 6 and 7 (see below). The prophecy of the resettled Parthenope’s growth and fame is not in “Commentary V” as we now have it.

#### Chapter 5

Again, “Commentary V” serves as a source for this narration. Regarding Parthenope, cf. fol. 89<sup>r</sup>, “et dum pro fundamentis murorum effoderunt, cadaver cuiusdam mulieris que Parthenopes dicta est invenerunt, de cuius eventus nomine vocaverunt Parthenopen.” The citations of Virgil and Ovid, here used to prove the currency of the name “Parthenope,” were in “Commentary V” used to prove the city’s frequent description as “otiosa”: see fol. 89<sup>v</sup>, “Hec civitas Neapolis ociosa dicitur a poetis presertim a Virgilio, Oracio, et Ovidio. Vir. in quarto Geor. vocat eam dulcem sed ocio ignobili marcidam unde ait, ‘Illo Virgilium me temporis dulcis alebat Parthenope florentem studiis ignobilis ocii.’ Oracius in Epodo ‘ociam,’ unde sentit ‘hec ociosa Neapolis et omne vicinum oppidum.’ Ovid. vero 15 Meth. dicit ipsam civitatem Neapolim natam in ocio unde ait ‘et in ocio natam Parthenopem.’” The citations ultimately derive from Virgil, *Georgics*, Book IV, lines 563–564, and Ovid,

*Metamorphoses*, Book XV, lines 711–712. Isidore noted that Parthenope was named for a virgin buried there, but without identifying her as a Sicilian princess: “Parthenope a Parthenope quadam virgine illic sepulta Parthenope appellata; quod oppidum postea Augustus Neapolim esse maluit.” See *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1911, repr. 1957), at Book 15, chapter 1, line 60. Papias was an eleventh-century grammarian whose *Vocabulista* or dictionary (ed. Boninus Mombritius [Venice, 1496; repr. Turin, 1966]), included an entry for the word “Parthenope” very similar to Isidore’s: “Parthenope a Parthenope quadam virgine illic sepulta dicta est quam Augustus postea nominavit Neapolim.”

### Chapter 6

On Tiberius, whose origins and motive for founding Neapolis are offered here, see below in the notes to chapter 7. The notion that Tiberius was originally Palaepolitan probably derives ultimately from Livy, who noted that Palaepolis and Neapolis were different settlements but settled by a single people: see below in the notes to chapter 8, where the citation from Livy (via “Commentary V”) is provided. The *Cronaca* gives a vague textual reference, “secundo se scrive,” for the exact placement of Neapolis “across the foothills of Mount Falerno.” This description does not appear in Livy. If it was in the original “Commentary V,” it was not retained in our surviving copy. The reference to Sant’Elmo, a castle built by Robert of Anjou (1309–1343), suggests that the hill in question is that now known as Vomero, an extension of which, known as Pizzofalcone, stretches to the shoreline.

### Chapter 7

The principal source for this chapter is the one given by the *Cronaca*, namely, the inscription on the façade of a temple on Naples’ ancient forum, converted into the church of San Paolo Maggiore. The façade and inscription survived until the seventeenth century, and the latter was recorded in Benedetto di Falco’s sixteenth-century *Descrittione dei luoghi antiqui*: ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΙΟΥΛΙΟΣ ΤΑΡΣΟΣ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΟΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΗ ΠΟΛΕΙ ΤΟΝ ΝΑΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΕΝ ΤΩΙ ΝΑΩΙ ΠΕΛΑΓΩΝ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ ΑΠΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΟΣ ΣΥΝΤΕΛΕΣΑΣ ΕΚ ΤΩΝΙ ΔΙΩΝ ΚΑΘΙΕΡΟΣΕΝ. Benedetto rendered it in Latin as “Tiberius Julius Tarsus

Iovis filiis et civitati templum et ea que sunt in templo Pelagon Augusti libertus et procurator ex propriis condidit et consecravit;” others, however, (like the late-fifteenth-century author Fabio Giordano) translated ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΟΙΣ as “Dioscuris,” as apparently did Bartolomeo or his source. On this inscription see Benedetto di Falco, *Descrittione dei luoghi antichi*, ed. Ottavio Morisani (Naples, 1972), 44, and Bartolomeo Capasso, *Napoli greco-romana* (Naples, 1905, repr. 1978), 185–186.

Niccolò Deoprepi of Reggio lived in Naples from 1310 to 1335, and served king Robert as a physician and translator of Greek texts, especially Galen. Francesco Lo Parco, in his twelve-page essay *Niccolò da Reggio grecista italiota del secolo XIV e l'interpretazione dell'epigrafe greca del tempio dei Dioscuri di Napoli ricordata dalla 'Cronaca di Partenope'* (Naples, 1909), argues that Niccolò did indeed translate this inscription, and that the garbled nature of the *Cronaca's* translation is the result of copyists' errors. However, the *Cronaca's* surrounding description makes clear that the contents of the inscription were poorly understood from the beginning. For instance, Bartolomeo identifies the temple as dedicated to Apollo rather than the Dioscuri, attributes to Tiberius the construction of the city as well as the temple, and describes Tiberius as an early Greek inhabitant of the region rather than a freedman of the Roman imperial era. Niccolò, an expert in Greek, was therefore certainly not responsible for the translation offered here, and his name was probably invoked to lend more authority to the Tiberius story. On the etymology of “Neapolis,” cf. Commentary V, fol. 89<sup>r</sup>: “Neapolim, hoc est novam civitatem, vocaverunt: ‘Nea’ grece ‘novum,’ ‘polis’ ‘civitas.’”

## Chapter 8

The first part of this chapter recapitulates the origins of the Greeks who settled the Bay of Naples, already described in the *Cronaca* chapter 1. The relevant passage of Livy is cited in “Commentary V,” at fol. 90<sup>v</sup>: “Titi Livius Palepolis fuit haud procul inde ubi Neapolis sita est duobus urbibus populus idem habitata cumanis erant oriundi cumani a Calcide Euboyca originem trahunt classe qua advecti ab domo fuerunt primo insulam Senariam et Pithecusas deinde incontinentem ausi transferre sedes.” Cf. Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, VIII: 21, ll. 5–6: “Palaepolis fuit haud procul inde ubi nunc Neapolis sita est; duabus urbibus populus idem habitabat. Cumis erant oriundi ...” (see the Loeb edition of *Ab urbe condita* vol. 4 [Books VIII–X], trans. B.O. Foster, Cambridge, MA, 1926, repr.

1982). Regarding “Lactantius,” “Commentary V” at 89<sup>r</sup> also writes, “Que vera omnia intelliguntur ex verbis Lactantii [*crossed out and corrected to* Lucretii] li. 4 dicentis Cumam incole a parentibus disgressi Parthenopen urbem condiderunt.” As noted in Chapter Four, n. 4 above, the context here indicates that the intended source was Lutatius, whose lost *Historia communis* was cited by later commentators of Virgil’s *Georgics* on the origins of the Greeks of the Bay of Naples.

The second part of the chapter, treating Naples’ war with Rome, doubtless took its inspiration from the brief narration of this war in “Commentary V” in its entry on Nola, at fol. 114<sup>r</sup>: “Nolani, ut dicit Livi. 8 Ab urbe condita, miserunt cum beneventanis ad capiendam Palepolim et Neapolim equitum duo milia. Quas et ceperunt, sed Publius Filo consul romanorum veniens Palepolim et Neapolim eas obsedit et ordinacione Nimphii et Carialai civium palepolitanensum cepit et exclusis sagacitate beneventanis nolani per adversam partis urbis viam Nolam ferentes effugerunt.” The ultimate source for this episode, as “Commentary V” indicates, was Livy, Book VIII, at chapters 22–26 (ed. cit., pp. 84–105). Bartolomeo follows “Commentary V” in altering Livy’s account in several ways. Livy’s Samnites are, in “Commentary V,” Beneventans. More notably, “Commentary V” omits Livy’s description of the Greeks (i.e. the Neapolitans and Palaepolitans) as fools for allying against Rome with neighbors who turned into the Greeks’ captors and oppressors, and omits as well the Greeks’ poignant plea to their enemies, the Romans, to free them from these “allies.” Finally, “Commentary V” makes two native Palaepolitans, not the Roman general, the leading figures in Palaepolis’ eventual liberation. (Their names, Nymphius and Charilaus, are rendered as Nimphio and Carialai in “Commentary V.”) These subtle changes cast Naples in a more positive light, and the *Cronaca* follows “Commentary V” in all of them. However, Bartolomeo appears to have consulted Livy directly as well, for he included a few details not found in “Commentary V,” at least as we now have that text. See the discussion in Chapter Four above.

### Chapter 9

A few clues suggest that this chapter, though seeming to treat a separate battle, actually derives from the same Livian episode as the previous chapter. The Nolans’ seizure of Naples and cruel treatment of the Neapolitans conforms to Livy’s account; more telling, the mention that

Alexander founded Alexandria in this year also appears in Livy VIII: 24, between the chapters devoted to the start of the siege of Palaepolis (chapters 22–23) and the end of the siege (chapters 25–26). In this chapter of the *Cronaca*, however, the various protagonists are allied differently (all are against Naples) and details such as the Nolans' encampment at a place called "Campo ad Nola" are not found in Livy. The reference to the "valley of Gaudio" may refer to the area known as the Gualdo (i.e. "forest") near Pozzuoli. On this toponym see Giuseppe de Blasiis, "Un castello svevo-angioino nel Gualdo di Napoli," *ASPN* n.s. 1 (1915), 103–105.

### Chapter 10

This chapter is a fairly faithful rendition of its cited source, Valerius Maximus' *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, VII: 3, paragraph 4. See the 2-volume edition by John Briscoe (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1998), at volume 2, pages 455–456. The references to the "Campo Romano" and castle at Somma (modern Somma Vesuviana) are additions of the *Cronaca*.

### Chapter 11

This chapter closely follows the opening of Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, XXIII: 1 on Hannibal's siege of Naples, which occurred in 216bce: see the Loeb edition, vol. 6 (Books XXIII–XXV), trans. Frank Gardner Moore (Cambridge, MA, 1984).

### Chapter 12

Like the last chapter, this one is a fairly faithful treatment of Livy's *Ab urbe condita*, in this case XXII: 32. See the Loeb edition at vol. 5 (Books XXI–XXII), trans. B.O. Foster (Cambridge, MA, 1982). As noted in the Chapter Four above, its principal divergence is in placing this embassy to Rome (which occurred in 217bce) after rather than before Hannibal's siege, and in adding the local proverb that links the two re-ordered events causally, changes which cast Naples in a more flattering light.

*Chapter 13*

Basically a topographical description of ancient Naples, using medieval toponyms, this chapter has no textual source. The *Cronaca* places the forum on the upper decumanus, “Somma Piazza,” though it was located on the central decumanus. The “piazza” (here probably meaning *seggio* rather than “street”) of Porto was located close to the shore in the lower part of the medieval city. “Acquaro” referred to a neighborhood in the *seggio* of Porto and to the families living there: on this toponym see B. Capasso, *Topografia della città di Napoli nel secolo XI* (Naples, 1895; repr. 1984), 175.

*Chapter 14*

The names of these three later immigrants, Albino, Don Pietro, and Avorio, derive from local toponyms. The toponym “ad Albini” or “in regione Albiensi” is mentioned in the *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum* of the ninth century and was still current in the fourteenth century. See the edition of the *Gesta* by G. Waitz in *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et italicarum saec. VI–IX* (Hannover, 1878), 438, and G. de Blasiis, “Le case dei principi angioini,” *ASPN* 11 (1886), 458. “Don Pietro” is attested in an eleventh-century document that speaks of a gate called “de domino Petro de domino Adalgiso,” later demolished, which Bartolomeo Capasso placed between the Capuan and Nolan Gates: see his *Topografia*, op. cit., 32–33 and accompanying map. As for “Avorio,” it appears as the name of a neighborhood located near the loggia of the Genoese merchants, along the shore, in Boccaccio’s *Filostrato* VII: 29, and is also mentioned as a local toponym in his *Decameron*, Day Seven, Story 2. Regarding the six “original” *seggi* named here, Somma Piazza was apparently located on the upper decumanus, though as in chapter 13 it is associated with the forum. Sant’Archangelo was presumably on the central decumanus (here called the “second street”); so was San Paolo, centered on the church of that name, and Mercato Vecchio, on the site of the ancient forum near San Paolo. Capuana was further east on the central decumanus, near the Capuan Gate. Nido was on the lower decumanus.

## Chapter 15

The *seggio* of Portanova is here located in the neighborhood of Avorio, hence in the mercantile district by the shoreline as also in Boccaccio (see the notes to the previous chapter above); Porto is located nearby. On the dissensions between the *seggi* of Capuana and Nido and others, like Porto and Portanova, deemed less “noble,” see the Chapter Three, at nn. 42–48.

The citations describing Naples as “otiosa” derive from “Commentary V,” fol. 89<sup>v</sup>, some of which were used above in the *Cronaca* chapter 5 to prove the currency of the name Parthenope. See the notes to chapter 5 above for the citation. The *Cronaca* also summarizes Ovid’s surrounding lines, especially 709–712, describing the Campanian coast. The citations of Seneca also come from “Commentary V,” at fol. 90<sup>r</sup>: “Seneca theatrum neapolitanorum se ingressum fuisse firmat in epistolis ad Lucillum epistola 76 dicens, ‘pudet autem me generis humani quociens scolam intravi preter ipsum theatrum neapolitanorum,’” and a few lines below on the same folio, “multe domus terremotu ruere sicut ait Seneca Questionibus naturalibus dicens, Neapolis q privatim multa, puplice nihil admisit leviter ingenti malo perscripta.” The citation of Seneca’s epistle 76 in “Commentary V” is exact. Cf. Seneca, *Naturales Quaestiones*, trans. Thomas H. Corcoran (Cambridge, MA, 1972), VI. 27.1 (pp. 204–205), and *Select Letters of Seneca*, ed. Walter C. Summers (London, 1910), 72.

## Chapter 16 (16–17B)

“Commentary V” cites Florus in its description of Capua, fol. 92<sup>r-v</sup>: “Lucius Anneus Florus in Epitomate suo L. et dicit Capuanam civitatem fuisse olim unam de tribus maximis orbis terre unde ait, ‘Ipsa caput urbium Capua que inter tres maximas Romam Cartaginemque numerata.’” The *Cronaca* faithfully cites a longer excerpt of the same passage, substituting Florus’ Liber and Ceres with Venus and Bacchus. Cf. L. Anneus Florus, *Epitomae de Tito Livio bellorum omnium annorum DCC libri II*, trans. Edward Seymour Forster (New York, 1929, repr. 1995), Book I, chapter 11 (pp. 50–52): “Omnium non modo Italiae, sed toto orbe terrarum pulcherrima Campaniae plaga est. Nihil mollius caelo: denique bis floribus vernat. Nihil uberius solo: ideo Liberi Cererisque certamen dicitur. Nihil hospitalius mari: hic illi nobiles portus



Caieta, Misenus, tepentes fontibus Baiæ, Lucrinus et Avernus, quaedam maris otia. Hic amicti vitibus montes Gaurus, Falernus, Massicus, et pulcherrimus omnium Vesuvius, Aetnaei ignis imitator. Urbes ad mare Formiæ, Cumæ, Puteoli, Neapolis, Herculaneum, Pompei, et ipsa caput ubrium Capua, quondam inter tres maximas [romam carthaginemque] numerata. Pro hac urbe, his regionibus populus romanus samnitas invadit ....”

Eustazio of Matera was a thirteenth-century poet from Basilicata whose *Planctus Italiae* described a number of southern Italian cities and their grief over Frederick II’s death. The text is known only through fragments preserved by other authors; the relevant passage here is preserved in “Commentary V” fol. 89<sup>r-v</sup>:

Inclita Parthenope generosa Neapolis alto  
 Nomen ab Enea que renovata tenes  
 Culta prius grecis de nomine Parthenopeis  
 Parthenope dicta, regia regis eras  
 Post pius Eneas urbem renovavit et auxit.

Bartolomeo Capasso edited this fragment of the *Planctus* based on the text of IX C 24 just cited: see his *Historia diplomatica regni Siciliae inde ab anno 1250 ad annum 1266* (Naples, 1874), 354.

The reading “Missino” in the base text, rendered “Missina” or “Messina” in some copies, refers to Misenus, an ancient port in the Bay of Naples.

Virgil’s role in creating Naples’ underground waterways and wells has no known textual source. Marcellus’ governance of Naples in emperor Octavian’s time, and Virgil’s relationship to Marcellus, are mentioned on several occasions in “Commentary V,” e.g. fol. 89<sup>v</sup>, “constat namque civitas ipsam fuisse Marcelli nepotis Octaviani augusti,” and below on the same folio, citing John of Salisbury, “Narrat Policratus [*sic*] libro 1 c. 4 quod Virgilius Marcellum neapolitanum interrogavit an avem vellet construere ....” The etymology of “Naples” as “domna de nove cita” is not found in the surviving copy of “Commentary V” (though other etymologies are given on fol. 89<sup>r</sup>); this particular etymology is found in the *Vita Athanasii*, a source certainly utilized by our author. Cf. the edition of G. Waitz, in *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum*, at 440: “Hanc denique Octavianus Augustus ‘Neapolim’ iussit vocari, id est novem civitatum domatrix.”

## Chapter 17 (18B)

The “fly legend” as told here probably derives from Gervase of Tilbury’s *Otia imperialia* of circa 1200: see *Otia imperialia. Recreation for an emperor*, ed. and trans. S.E. Banks and J.W. Binns (Oxford, 2002), 576–577. Gervase here mentions that the fly retained its power only as long as it remained undamaged in its (unidentified) place; the *Cronaca* instead says it was moved, to the Castel Cicala (a castle in nearby Nola). “Commentary V,” at fol. 89<sup>v</sup>, offers the very different version found in John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus*, which it duly cites. The *Cronaca* however borrows three details from “Commentary V.” “Commentary V” identifies the fly’s specific location on the Capuan Gate and describes it as “large as a frog” (“in magnitudine unius rane”). The *Cronaca* changes the location to the adjoining Castello di Capuana, and describes the talisman as a fly or a frog. Finally, the *Cronaca* mistakenly asserts that the legend is also found in Alexander [Neckam]’s work, and probably gleaned the name of this authority from “Commentary V,” where Alexander is mentioned earlier in the same paragraph regarding two other Virgilian legends. On the medieval tradition of Virgil as a magician, the seminal work remains Domenico Comparetti, *Virgilio nel medio evo* (Florence, 1896); see also the comments added to later editions and translations of this work, e.g. those of Giorgio Pasquale in the 1941 reprint, and of Jan Ziolkowski to the English translation (*Virgil in the Middle Ages*, trans. E.F.M. Benecke [Princeton, 1997]), and John Webster Spargo, *Virgil the Necromancer* (Cambridge, MA), 1934.

## Chapter 18 (19B)

The source for this legend is almost certainly “Commentary V,” at fol. 89<sup>v</sup>, which cites Alexander Neckam as its source: “Narrat Alexander namque libro De naturis rerum quod cum Neapolis quondam sanguisagarum letali peste vexaretur liberata est a Virgilio erudine aurea in fundum putei. Quod extracta evolutis multorum annorum curriculis a puteo mundato replevit infinitus numerus erudinum civitatem. Nec sedata est pestis antequam sanguisuga alia in puteum mitteretur.” For Neckam’s work, which Bartolomeo almost certainly did not consult directly, see *Alexandri Neckam De naturis rerum*, ed. Thomas Wright (London, 1863).

*Chapter 19 (20B)*

“Commentary V” is again the source for this legend: see fols. 89<sup>v</sup>–90<sup>r</sup>, “Fertur eciam quod fieri fecit equum ereum ut alii equi aliquo morbo vexati eum respicientes ipsius visu sanitatis remedia reportarent. Hic equus fuit iuxta ecclesia Sancti Ioannes maioris postmodum surreptis ad archiepiscopatum extitit deportatus. Quem equum cum rex Carolus victam urbem intraret admirans ei disticon fecit in hunc modum ut refert Eustasius in suo Plantu Ytalie libro LI: Hactenus effrenis nunc frenum paret habenis: rex domat hunc equum parthenopenis equus.” The *Cronaca* adds a number of details to this account. It states that the horse was punctured by jealous horse doctors and lost its power, and that it was melted down in 1322 to make the cathedral bells. It also associates the horse with the symbols of the *seggi* of Capuana and Nido.

The Group B version of the *Cronaca* gives this distych in the same order of verses as Eustazio of Matera (to judge by the copy of Eustazio in “Commentary V”), whereas the Group A text reverses the lines.

*Chapter 20 (21B)*

I have not found this legend in any of the earlier accounts of Virgilian legends. It probably represents an adaptation of the familiar formula of a talisman in the form of the offending pest that protects against that pest. The choice of a *cicala* (grasshopper) may relate to the Castel Cicala in Nola, which was mentioned in the *Cronaca*’s version of the “fly legend” (chapter 17 [18B]), and seems to suggest local circulation and multiplication of Virgilian legends.

*Chapter 21 (22B)*

The “meat market” legend appears in both Gervase of Tilbury’s *Otia imperialia* and “Commentary V” (as well as other early sources on the Virgilian legends), and could have come from either. Cf. “Commentary V” at fol. 89<sup>v</sup>: “Narrat Alexander quod cum marcellus [*sic*] neapolitanus carnes illesas a corrupcione diu servare non posset, prudencia Virgillii quodam vi herbarum conditas carnes quingentis annis elapsis recentissimas et optimi saporis suavitate servari fecit, nam macellum Neapoli construxisse fertur in quo nulla caro putresceret.” Gervase’s version (ed. cit., 576–579) reads, “Iam nunc ad civitatem Campanie Neapolim redea-

mus, in qua macellum est in cuius pariete insertum perhibetur a Virgilio frustum carnis tante efficacie quod, dum illic erit inclusum, in ipsius macelli continentia nulla caro, quanto quanto tempore vetustata, nares olfacientis aut intuentis aspectum aut comedentis saporem offendet.” The *Cronaca*’s reference to meat hung in an arch of the meat market seems to tie it a bit more closely to Gervase, but our author clearly consulted both works. He adds to them the cause of the decayed meat (a contrary wind) and the specific location of the meat market, the “Mercato Vecchio” on the ancient forum of the old city.

#### *Chapter 22 (23B)*

The source for this legend is Gervase of Tilbury (ed. cit., 582–585). The passage is rather too long to cite in full here, but in some details the *Cronaca*’s version is very close to Gervase, e.g. in describing the talisman as a “bronze image” holding a trumpet to its mouth (in Gervase, “imago enea bucinam ad os tenens”) and the specification that the contrary wind damaged fruits and crops. The *Cronaca* adds the name for this wind, and states that it blows in April, rather than Gervase’s May; it does not explicitly state that the talisman had already been destroyed. Gervase located this trumpeter on Monte Vergine, whose magic garden he had discussed in the previous paragraph. The *Cronaca* treats this garden, located in the same spot, in the next chapter (see below).

#### *Chapter 23 (24B)*

Like the last legend, this one probably derives from Gervase of Tilbury (ed. and loc. cit. in notes to chapter 22 [23B] above): “Erat in confinio eiusdem civitatis Neapolitane, velut ex opposito, mons Virginum, in cuius declivio inter prerupta saxorum aditu gravi Virgilius ortum plantaverat, multis herbarum generibus consitum. In hoc invenitur herba lucii, quam oves cece quandoque tangentes, statim acutissimum visum recipiunt.” The *Cronaca* however has altered several details. Where Gervase calls the garden inaccessible, the *Cronaca* claims that the path to it is revealed only to the virtuous; where Gervase identifies a single plant that heals blind sheep, the *Cronaca* describes many herbs that heal sick men.

*Chapter 24 (25B)*

This legend of the “fish rock” is not found in any earlier textual sources. The object was a well-known local landmark, attested in a document of 1296 (“aedificatione apothecarum inter Logiam Januensium et Petram Piscium”) and in another of the early fourteenth century (“loco qui dicitur vulgariter Petra de lu Pisce”). Both documents are cited in Giuliana Vitale, *Élite burocratica e famiglia. Dinamiche nobiliari e processi di costruzione statale nella Napoli angioina-aragonese* (Naples, 2003), 41, 43.

*Chapter 25 (26B)*

This legend is found in Gervase of Tilbury (ed. cit., 578–583), who claims to have witnessed the sculpted faces’ magic power himself and to have had it explained to him by his friend, John of Pignatelli, archdeacon of Naples. The *Cronaca* omits Gervase’s detailed description of the circumstances of his eyewitness account, but the explanation of the magic power of the faces and their location is the same. Unlike Gervase, the *Cronaca* describes the weeping face as that of a woman.

*Chapter 26 (27B)*

The jousting story in this chapter is found in no other collection of Virgilian legends and strictly speaking is not “magical,” since Virgil merely inaugurates the jousting games. It features a well-known local site, the field called “Carbonara” just outside the city walls to the northeast. Petrarch observed and lamented the violent jousting matches held at this site during a visit in 1343: see *Rerum familiarum libri V*, 6 (facing-page Latin-Italian edition by Ugo Dotti published under the title *Le familiari*, [Rome, 1991]). As discussed in Chapter Two above, the date 1380 (MCCC lxxx), found in most manuscript copies (P1 instead offers 1480), must be an error, probably for 1330 (written perhaps as MCCC et xxx).

The second legend mentioned in this chapter, regarding the “four human heads” that offer news of events in the four corners of the world, seems to represent a local adaptation of the “Salvatio Romae” legend found only in Alexander Neckam’s *De naturis rerum* (ed. cit. p. 310). As there is no evidence Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa knew Neckam’s work

and some evidence he did not (i.e. the wrong attribution in chapter 17 [18B]), this legend probably represents a mutation through other sources, oral or written.

### Chapter 27 (28B)

The “snake legend” is found in Gervase of Tilbury (ed. cit., 578–579): “Est in eadem civitate porta Dominica, Nolam Campanie civitatem olim inclitam respiciens, in cuius ingressu est via lapidus artificiose constructa. Sub huius vie sigillo conclusit Virgilius omne genus reptilis nocivi. Under provenit quod, cum civitas illa in ambitu plurimum spaciosa tota columpnis subterraneis innitatur, nusquam in cavernis aut rimis interioribus aut ortis infra urbis menia conclusis vermis nocivus reperitur.” The *Cronaca* is quite faithful to its source here, adding only the possibility that snakes might enter the city in hay or straw brought from the countryside.

Biographical information on Virgil comes from “Commentary V,” fol. 90<sup>r-v</sup>: “In hac civitate Virgilius moram trahebat tempore quo Julius Sirie et Capadocie populos aliosque iuxta Eufratem fluvium debellabat. In qua etate fere 24 annorum librum Bucc. et Georgicum composuit unde ait in 4 Geor., ‘Hec ego super arborum cultu percorum quam canebam et super arboribus dum Caesar magnus [...] Illo Virgilium me tempore dulcis alebat Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis ocii.’ Neapoli ossa Virgillii de Brundusio delata sunt tumulo posita intra secundum lapidem extra clipta via Putheolana ubi disticon est: ‘Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuerunt, tenet nunc Parthenope.’” The *Cronaca* mistranslates the *Georgics* quotation in a way more flattering to Naples: see Chapter Four at n. 8.

### Chapter 28 (29B)

The source for this chapter is Gervase of Tilbury (ed. cit., 586–587). Like Gervase, the *Cronaca* claims that the inscriptions above the baths were destroyed by jealous doctors of (the medical school at) Salerno, though the *Cronaca* is more insistent on the doctors’ exploitation of the poor, and adds the anecdote on the doctors’ death at sea, by divine providence, as a result of their vices. The *Cronaca* embellishes the tale in other ways: identifying the healing ingredients in the water, apparently via oral tradition (“secundo opinione de multi”); singling out the bath called “Tritula”; and describing the identifying images engraved in stone above each bath. The *Cronaca* also places the baths near Baia rather than

Gervase's Pozzuoli, though the general region is the same. These baths were well known in the Middle Ages, and celebrated in Peter of Eboli's *De balneis puteolarum* of circa 1200, translations and variations of which became common in the fourteenth century. For an overview of this baths literature, see Livio Petrucci, "Le fonti per la conoscenza della topografia delle terme Flegree dal XII al XV secolo," *ASPN* 97 (1979), 99–129.

### Chapter 29 (30B)

Again, the source for this chapter is Gervase of Tilbury (ed. cit., 586–587). Gervase did not claim that Virgil created the tunnel, only that his magic spell protected from ambush those passing through it. Petrarch, in his *Itinerarium* of 1358, observed that the legend as told in the *Cronaca*, i.e. of Virgil's creation of the tunnel, was current in Naples in 1341, when Petrarch visited the city and King Robert asked him about this belief. (See the Latin edition by Francesco lo Monaco, *Itinerario in Terra Santa* [Bergamo, 1990], at 58–59, and the edition of the medieval "Neapolitan" translation by Alfonso Paoella, *Volgarizzamento meridionale anonimo di Francesco Petrarca, 'Itinerarium'* [Bologna, 1993], at 25–26.) The *Cronaca's* version is much longer and more detailed than that of Gervase, and the divergences of the Group B version must represent simply a paraphrase of the original *Cronaca*, since none of its detail is found in the source.

The citation of Seneca, from epistle 57, is found neither in Gervase nor in "Commentary V" (which does not feature this legend, but whose geographical survey of the region might reasonably have mentioned this passage of Seneca in another context). Since the *Cronaca's* other citations of Seneca do come from "Commentary V," this may be another case, like that regarding Florus, where our author was inspired by textual references in "Commentary V" to seek out a copy of the original classical work. The passage in Seneca reads, "a ceromate nos haphe exceptit in crypta neapolitana. Nihil illo carcere longius, nihil illis facibus obscurius, quae nobis praestant nont ut per tenebras videamus, sed ut ipsas" (in *Select letters of Seneca*, ed. Walter C. Summers [London, 1910], at 65–66). The *Cronaca* author apparently misconstrued "haphe" as "alphe," which he treats as Seneca's name for the tunnel.

*Chapter 30 (31B)*

“Commentary V” offers a much briefer account of this legend at fol. 89<sup>v</sup>, without associating the magic egg with the Castel dell’Ovo: “Refert etiam quod in chrathere quodam vitreo ovum Virgilius inclusit, quo fata civitatis Neapolis pendere dicebat. Et tam diu civitatem duraturam foret quam diu ovum sine lesione maneret.” Virgilian legends claiming that Naples was founded on an egg, or that a “castle in the sea” in Naples was founded on two eggs, are found in the thirteenth-century *Image du monde* and the *Roman de Cléomadès* respectively: see J.W. Spargo, *Virgil the Necromancer* (Cambridge, MA, 1934), 61–62. The castle in question, previously known as the “castellum maris,” seems to have been called the Castel dell’Ovo only from the fourteenth century forward.

*Chapter 31 (32B)*

This legend is found only in the *Cronaca*, and seems to have been inspired by the similar story narrated in the following chapter. Domenico Comparetti (*Vergil in the Middle Ages*, 342n) noted that *Chirone*, i.e. the centaur Chiron of ancient myth, was treated as a medical authority in the Middle Ages, for instance in the *Herbarium Apulei Platonici traditum a Chirone centauro magistro Achillis*, and that the name of the companion mentioned in this chapter, Filomeno, probably derives from an ancient physician to whom certain home remedies were attributed in the Middle Ages. Monte Barbaro is the hill overlooking Pozzuoli, just to its north.

The variant reading at “Chironte” offered by manuscripts SN<sub>1</sub> and V, and partially by PL, may be original, for it seems likely that the others committed a *saut de même au même* here on the word “Chironte.”

*Chapter 32 (32B)*

This legend is recounted in Gervase of Tilbury (ed. cit., 802–805). Gervase writes that the Neapolitans readily agreed to give the Englishman Virgil’s bones since they did not themselves know where they lay and hence thought it impossible to locate them. Only when the Englishman, using his own knowledge, managed to uncover the buried tomb did they hesitate to hand over Virgil’s bones, fearing their loss would harm the



city. The *Cronaca* telescopes this account, suggesting that the Neapolitans already knew where the tomb lay, were therefore reluctant to obey the king's command from the start, but nonetheless led the Englishman to the tomb. Gervase states that the bones were then placed "in castello maris." Gervase's modern editors translate this as "a castle out at sea," though *castellum maris* was the usual name for what came to be called the Castel dell'Ovo, which is how the *Cronaca* here names it. The *Cronaca* also adds that once Naples became Christian, the bones were buried in a wall of the castle. Its citation of Gervase regarding the "experiments" he conducted with Virgil's magic book is correct; the *Cronaca* then adds what it characterizes as oral traditions ("credese et tenese") regarding other magic worked by the book and its eventual move to the papal treasury in Rome.

#### Chapter 33 (34B)

The source for this chapter is the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio*, section II, paragraph 1. See the edition by G.M. Monti, "Il cosiddetto 'Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio' fonte della 'Cronaca di Partenope,'" in idem, *Dai normanni agli aragonesi* (Trani, 1936), 137–144, where this passage appears on 138. It is short enough to give in its entirety, and indicates the fidelity of the *Cronaca di Partenope's* translation, including its repetitive aspects: "Antequam Chrystus Neapoli coleretur, cives ipsius more gentilium offerebant sacrificia dijs in summitate cuiusdam montis prope Neapolim qui nunc dicitur Ara Vetere, de tercerio capitis montis, a quo loco de Ara Vetere eo quod a civitate distabat, paulo ante adventum beati Petrj Neapoli deductum erat in planitie. Ubi nunc dicitur Ara Petri vel Petrus ad Aram. Et fiebant ibi eorum sacrificia more predicto gentilium. Et propterea dicitur Sanctus Petrus ad Aram, licet aliqui dicant Ara Petri."

#### Chapter 34 (35B)

The translation of the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio* continues in this long chapter, opening with the sentence immediately following the last sentence translated in chapter 33 (34B), "Qui quidem beatus Petrus filius Joannis de provintia Galileae de vico Bethsayde," (section II, paragraph 1) and continuing through the end of section II, paragraph 3: ed cit., 138–140.

Two short passages of this chapter that are not found in the *SMP* (at least as we now have it) do appear in one of the *SMP*'s source texts, the *Vita S. Aspren*: the sentence “et si era in de lo errore deli pagani et se fosse religione ipso se poterrey chiamare religioso,” and the short list of Aspren's healing miracles at the end of the chapter. See “De S. Aspren vel Aspreno episcopo et confessore Neapoli in Campania commentarius historico-criticus,” in *Acta Sanctorum Augusti*, vol. 1 (Antwerp, 1733; repr. 1970), 201. The *Cronaca* vivifies its source-texts with a few additions: the phrase “et como è costumato lo homo avere compassione de li amici et dare ad ipsi maturo consiglyo se se puote, et avere habilitate de tempo de seccorrerele,” the description of Aspren running faster to meet Peter and urging the aged Candida to hurry, and that of Aspren's preaching as “cava[ndo] lo venino delle interiore de lo antiquo tragone.”

#### Chapter 35 (36B)

The text of this chapter comes from the *Vita S. Aspren*, ed. and loc. cit. (see notes to previous chapter): “Conquistata Neapoli Christo domino, Romam Petrus ire decrevit, sed ad preces Neapolitanae plebis apostolus Aspren neapolitanum praesulem consecravit: qui ad pontificii proventus apicem, verbo doctrinae invigilare coepit instantius, praedicationi insistere, et usque ad mortem opportune et importune constantissime indeficiens atque infatigabilis praedicavit. Obiit autem senex plenus dierum, et operibus virtuosus, tertio Nonas Augusti, miraculis coruscando.” The *Cronaca* offers a rather verbose translation of this passage, and adds the year in which Peter left Naples for Rome.

#### Chapter 36 (37B)

After the first sentence (the author's own intervention), the *Cronaca* picks up where it left off translating the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio*, starting now with section II, paragraph 4 (ed. cit., 140–141). The comparison to the biblical couple Zacharias and Elizabeth is not found in the *SMP* as we now have it, but was found in a legend of Saint Aspren identified by Gennaro Maria Monti as a source for the *SMP*: “Demum is magnis licet componere parva, alteri Zachariae, Elisabeth alteri Joannes nascitur.” See the same article by Monti, “Il cosiddetto ‘Chronicon,’” at 145.

*Chapter 37 (38B)*

This short chapter translates the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio* section II, paragraph 5 (ed. cit., 141). It adds that Aspren died “vecchissimo et plino de iorni” and that “socto loquale la xpiana fede habe principio.”

*Chapter 38 (39B)*

There is no known source for this chapter, nor does it require one, being simply an introduction to the prophecy recorded in the subsequent chapter. The Cumaean sibyl is described here as “one of the first [ancestors] of our people” or as “the first [ancestor] of our people,” i.e. of the Neapolitans, because of the Neapolitans’ origins among the first Greek settlers of Cumae, narrated in the opening chapters of the *Cronaca*.

*Chapter 39 (40B)*

As Raimondo Anecchino has observed (*La leggenda virgiliana nei campi flegrei* [Naples, 1937], 4–29), the Cumaean sibyl was considered the most authoritative such prophetess in Roman late antiquity and the Middle Ages, swiftly assimilated into a Christian framework as foretelling Christ and closely associated with Virgil, who wrote of her in the *Aeneid* and who was also believed to have foretold Christ’s coming in the fourth Eclogue. Anecchino does not, however, provide a reference to the precise text of the prophecy attributed to her, nor have I been able to locate one. Our author’s proximate source may have been “Commentary V,” whose entry on Cumae mentions the Cumaean sibyl (fol. 119<sup>v</sup>, “et civitas sibille”) and cites verses from Virgil’s *Aeneid* VI that are also reproduced in the *Cronaca*, and whose lost early folios could have contained this prophecy. Even so, the ultimate source of the text found in this chapter remains to be identified.

*Chapter 40 (41B)*

This chapter returns to the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio*, translating section III (“In dedicationis cappelle Sanctae Mariae de Principio”), lectio prima (in the edition of G.M. Monti in “Il cosiddetto

‘Chronicon’” at 141). The date given in the *SMP* is 343, and Silvester is here the thirty-fourth after Peter; he is not described in the *SMP* as “de natione romana.” The Lateran is described in the *SMP* as “in toto orbe matrem ecclesiarum omnium.” The church of Saints Peter and Paul is in the *SMP* the *churches* of Saints Peter and Paul. The *Liber Pontificalis*, doubtless a source for the *SMP*, does describe Silvester as “de natione romana” and as the thirty-fourth bishop of Rome, whence he was the thirty-third after Peter—see the edition of L. Duchesne, *Le Liber pontificalis, texte, introduction et commentaire*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1981), 170. To the *SMP*’s list of lands donated by Constantine to the Church, the *Cronaca di Partenope* adds Pentapolis and the March of Ancona. The chapter’s last sentence, on the “poison legend,” is also an addition of the *Cronaca di Partenope*: for its likely derivation from the *Gesta Sancti Silvestri*, see Chapter Four above at nn. 26–28.

#### Chapter 41 (42B)

The source for this chapter is the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio*, section III, lectio secunda. “Sancto Zonio” is the *Cronaca di Partenope*’s translation of “sanctum Cosmum,” an eighth-century bishop of Naples (so identified in the *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum*—see the edition of G. Waitz at 422). The *SMP*’s phrase “[instituit] canonicos sacerdotes septem et alios septem dyaconos prebendatos” is rendered in a more confused way in our work. The bracketed phrase on which some manuscripts commit a *saut de même au même* is in the source-text “[more] metropolitanarum ecclesiarum Grecie nam in omni metropolitana ecclesia Grecie ...” In the *SMP* it is not the cimiliarca but the Greek clergy who “debent in dicta ecclesia ceteras fare facetias que dicuntur latine Squarastase.” In the following passage, the Group B manuscripts follow the sequence of the *SMP* in naming the six Greek churches first and afterward describing them as rich because built and endowed by Constantine.

#### Chapter 42 (43B)

This chapter translates the *Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio*, section III, lectio tertia (ed. G.M. Monti, “Il cosiddetto ‘Chronicon,’” 142). The *SMP* describes the church as “*olim* nominata ecclesia Stephanie.” This reflects the massive changes wrought to the cathedral from the 1290s, when the Stefania was demolished and replaced by a new cathedral, much

larger, reoriented ninety degrees, and incorporating the previously adjacent basilica called Santa Restituta. The *Cronaca di Partenope*, however, treats the name Stefania as still current and makes no mention of the cathedral's reconstruction and altered form.

#### Chapter 43 (44–45B)

The translation of the *SMP* continues in this chapter with section III, *lectiones quarta and quinta* (ed. cit., 142–143). The reference to authenticating textual sources is in the *SMP*: “ut plura instrumenta testantur, et in legenda beatj Athenasij enarratur.” The *Cronaca di Partenope* renders “anachorite” as “romite,” and “ecclesia beati Andreae apostoli” as “Sancto Andrea ad Nido.” Constantine's foundation of a basilica in Naples is mentioned in the *Liber pontificalis*, and the local medieval tradition identifying that basilica as Santa Restituta (found in the ninth-century *Gesta episcoporum Neapolitanorum* and in the *SMP*) has been confirmed by modern scholars: see for instance Duchesne's edition of the *Liber pontificalis* at 186 and the note on 200.

In Group A manuscripts, chapter 43 continues by translating the next text in the *SMP* (section III, *lectio sexta*: ed. cit., 143). Group B manuscripts offer this as a separate chapter (45B). Both versions of the *Cronaca di Partenope* omit a comparison made by the *SMP* between the miraculous water in which Restituta's remains were bathed and “miraculosum vinum sancti Antonij.” Group A manuscripts omit the final sentence of this *lectio* of the *SMP*—“Que quidem aqua quod est mirabile dictu, virtute Dei per annum et ultra imputrescibilis et saporosa servatur”—which is included in the Group B version.

#### Chapter 44 (46B)

The borrowings from the *SMP* conclude in this chapter with section III, *lectio octavo* (ed. cit., 144). The terms “cavaliere et cittadino” are plural in this source (“civium Euticetis et Acutij militum”) and should be understood to apply to both saints. The *Cronaca di Partenope* uses the verb “toccare” to translate “numerare.” It also gives a fairly loose translation of the *SMP* passage regarding the proverb about the chessboard: “cum dicatur proverbialiter, de omni re difficilj et invisibili ad computandum, istud computum maius est, et ad plus ascendit computum scaccherij, quasi dicat, computum scaccherij plurimum est infinitum.” Euty-

ches and Acutius were lay companions of saint Januarius, martyred with him under the emperor Diocletian circa 305.

#### Chapter 45 (47B)

The Council of Nicaea (325) and the years of Silvester's pontificate come from the *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. cit., 170–171. The *Liber* also notes Silvester's foundation of a church in his own name in Rome (“constituit beatus Silvester in urbe Roma titulum suum iuxta thermas Domitianas qui cognominantur Traianas, titulum Silvestri”), though the church is not associated with Silvester's burial place, given instead as “in cymiterio Priscillae, via Salaria” (ibid., 187). In 761 Silvester's relics were translated to the church of San Silvestro ‘in Capite’ in Rome: see *Butler's Lives of the Saints: Complete Edition*, ed. Herbert Thurston and Donald Attwater, 4 vols. (New York, 1963), at vol. 4, 644–645. Saint Nicholas was bishop of Myra in the late third and early fourth century; the mention of his investiture at the Council of Nicaea does not derive from the *Liber pontificalis*, and was probably added to the *Cronaca* due to local Neapolitan veneration of him. Agostino Pertusi has observed that his cult flourished in Naples long before the translation of his remains to Bari in 1087: he was included in the ninth-century necrology known as the “Marble Calendar” and a *Vita* of him was translated in Naples by John the Deacon later in the same century. The edition of the *Vita S. Nicolai* to which Pertusi refers does not describe Nicholas as appointed bishop at the Council of Nicaea, but only that he was already bishop of Myra in the time of Constantine. See A. Pertusi, “Ai confini tra religione e politica. La contesa per le reliquie di S. Nicola tra Bari, Venezia e Genova,” *Quaderni medievali* 5 (1978), 9; the edition of this *Vita* is in Karl Meisen, *Nikolauskult und Nikolausbrauch im Abendlande. Eine kultgeographisch-volkswissenschaftliche Untersuchung* (Düsseldorf, 1931; repr. Mainz, 1981), 527–530.

#### Chapter 46 (48B)

The story of Silvester's conversion of Helena (described as Jewish) and of other Jews, and his defeat of a dragon, come from the *Gesta S. Silvestri*. See the edition of B. Mombritius' fifteenth-century *Sanctuarium seu Vitae sanctorum*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1910), 516–531. The final comment regarding clerical vestments comes from the *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. cit., 171. As noted

in Chapter Four at n. 27, medieval copies of the *Liber pontificalis* sometimes included the more fantastical material of the *Gesta S. Silvestri* such as that cited in this chapter. Since Bartolomeo here repeats information from both texts, he may have consulted such an “expanded” copy of the *Liber* rather than encountering the *Gesta* as a separate work.

#### Chapter 47 (49B)

The story of Constantine’s and his daughter Constance’s double foundation of S. Giovanni Maggiore has no known textual source. Constantine had a sister, not a daughter, named *Constantia*, according to the *Liber pontificalis*, but other early-medieval *Lives* did feature a *Constantia* identified as Constantine’s daughter, who founded a church dedicated to Saint Agnes: see the *Liber pontificalis*, ed. cit., 180 and notes on 196–197. The *Cronaca*’s unusual description of the church as dedicated equally to John and to Lucy may reflect the author’s particular devotion to Lucy. As noted in Chapter Two, Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa’s son was given the rectorship of or income from the church of S. Lucia di Somma near Naples (in the town now known as Somma Vesuviana), which may have inspired our author’s particular interest in this saint.

#### Chapter 48 (50B)

The first paragraph of this chapter, which identifies Patricia as niece of the emperor Constantine, has no known source. The notion that Patricia obtained relics of the True Cross (specifically, iron from the nails with which Christ was crucified) from Helena, mother to Constantine, is based on legends of Helena’s discovery of the True Cross or *inventio crucis*, which circulated very widely from the early Middle Ages forward, for instance in Rufinus’ fifth-century *Church History*. The anecdote explaining the miraculous power of other filings from these nails to subdue a wild horse on which Constantine later rode to battle is also found in the legends of Helena’s *inventio crucis*. See E. Gordon Whatley, “Constantine the Great, the Empress Helen, and the Relics of the True Cross,” in *Medieval Hagiography. An Anthology*, ed. T. Head (London and New York, 2001), 77–95, which discusses and translates two early-medieval accounts of the *inventio crucis*, including the legend of Constantine’s bridle also related in the *Cronaca*. Possibly the monastery’s claim to possess such relics, long associated with Helena, combined with the circulation

of legends of Constantine's benefactions to Naples to inspire the identification of Patricia as a relative of Constantine and his mother.

The *Cronaca* awkwardly grafts this Constantinian legend onto an existing local *Vita* of Patricia, which was its source for the final section of the chapter, from "La dicta sancta Patricia tornando da Costantinopoli moriò" to the end. This *Vita* was authored by the Neapolitan cleric known as Leone presbytero, edited in "Vita altera S. Patriciae virginis auctore Leone presbytero," in *Acta Sanctorum. Augusti*, vol. 5 (Antwerp, 1741; repr. Brussels, 1970), 215–219. The exact date of this work is unknown, but must have been written between the mid-ninth and later twelfth century: see Annamaria Facchiano, *Monasteri femminili e nobiltà a Napoli tra Medioevo ed età moderna. Il necrologio di S. Patrizia (secc. XII–XVI)* (Altavilla Silentina, 1992), 13.

#### Chapter 49 (51B)

This episode is recounted in Procopius of Caesaria's *History of the Wars*, Book V, chapters 8–10 (trans. H.B. Dewing [Cambridge, MA, 1919; repr. 1993], 68–107). Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa must have had access to a Latin translation of this Greek work, or at least of this part of it: see Chapter Four, n. 34. For the corresponding narrative, see Procopius chapter 8, lines 7–8 on Neapolitan subjection to the Goths, and chapter 10, lines 28ff., which describe a slaughter of Neapolitans in terms very similar to the *Cronaca*: "And then a great slaughter took place .... And they kept killing all whom they encountered, sparing neither old nor young .... They did not even withhold their hand from the sanctuaries, but slew many of those who had taken refuge in them." This last sentence in Procopius continues, however, by noting that "Belisarius, visiting every part of the city, put a stop to this." Following paragraphs in Procopius give Belisarius' speech to his soldiers demanding clemency to the Neapolitans, with the result that "Belisarius released to the Neapolitans their women and children and the slaves, one and all, no insult having been experienced by them." The *Cronaca* does not acknowledge this clemency, concluding instead with a repopulation of the city by foreigners very similar to that of the account of the eighth-century Saracen siege (see notes to the following chapter). Belisarius' siege and capture of Naples, set in 535 in the *Cronaca*, occurred in 536.



*Chapter 50 (52B)*

A Latin account of the siege narrated in this chapter is found in a later-fourteenth-century manuscript, Vat. Ottobon. 2940. (This manuscript was the basis for the edition of G. Waitz, *Neapolitanorum victoria ficta*, in *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum* [Hannover, 1878], 465–466, with brief editorial comments at 402.) Because the Latin text is known only in this copy, which postdates the *Cronaca di Partenope*, it is possible that the *Cronaca* was the Latin copy's source and not vice versa. Though the episode is, as Waitz observed, obviously fictive, the general tenor of both accounts, and perhaps especially that of the *Cronaca*, reflects events and attitudes of the ninth century, strongly suggesting that an early-medieval text was the *Cronaca*'s source. For instance, contemporary Lombard documents speak of "depopulation" caused by Saracen attacks, but also of Muslim settlement in (in the *Cronaca*, immigration to) the region. Most notably, a major siege by North African Muslims took place in the 870s, and was lifted thanks to the aid offered by a Carolingian ruler; the city was not Naples but Salerno, and the Carolingian ruler was Louis II, but the parallels to this *Cronaca* episode are noteworthy. See Barbara Kreutz, *Before the Normans. Southern Italy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries* (Philadelphia, 1991), 51–56.

Given that the Vatican text is our only surviving comparable account, it is well to note their differences. The event is dated in the Vatican text to 798, but to 788 in the majority of *Cronaca* manuscripts. (Our base manuscript offers 888, despite references to Charlemagne [d. 814], Desiderius, king of the Lombards of north Italy [d. 786], and Pope Hadrian I [r. 772–795]). The *Cronaca* also offers some features not found in the Latin version. One is the addition of references to Africa, mentioned in the *Cronaca* both as a place whence the Saracens came and as the homeland for some later immigrants who repopulated Naples. Regarding these African immigrants, the *Cronaca* adds an aside on the African origins of Augustine and his friends and of Saint Gaudiosus, a fifth-century African bishop who founded a monastery in Naples after fleeing the Vandal invasion. This passage may derive from a *Vita* of Gaudiosus, as the *Cronaca* claims, although no such work survives. A tenth-century *Libellus miraculorum S. Agnelli*, which refers to Gaudiosus, also cites such a work ("quae in eius Vita descripta est"). See A. Vuolo, *Una testimonianza agiografica napoletana: Il 'libellus miraculorum S. Agnelli' (sec. X)* (Naples, 1987), and D. Ambrasi, "Il cristianesimo e la Chiesa napoletana dei primi secoli," *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 1 (Naples, 1969), pp. 702–703.

A second distinction between the Latin text and this episode of the *Cronaca* is the latter's repeated emphasis on "the French," i. e. Carolingian forces who come to Naples' aid and later settle in the city, including original material regarding two "French" dukes, Aymone and Bernardo. The *Cronaca* also identifies more specific individuals (the "duke of Oppido" and kings of Africa, Carthage, and Persia/Syria) and states that Naples' reinforcements gathered at the "campo ad Carlo," a field in the "Gualdo" or forested region near Pozzuoli that is identified by this name in a document of 1346. (On this field see G. de Blasiis, "Un castello," art. cit., 105.) While the Latin text declares that "Neapolitan blood was contaminated" on account of the immigration following this battle, the *Cronaca* adds that this now occurred "for the second time," reflecting its addition of the first "contamination" passage in the previous chapter.

Early manuscripts of both the Group A and Group B versions (P1, M1, PL, E) describe Desiderius and Adalgis as sons of Charlemagne (*Desiderio et Aldigisio figlyoli suoi ri de Lombardia*). The correct reading should be singular (*suo figliolo re*), such that Adalgis is simply the son of Desiderius, a reading found in five later copies.

#### Chapter 51 (53B)

The foundation of a church in honor of Saint Paul as a result of Naples' victory over the Saracens is recorded in the same Latin Saracen seige account connected to the previous chapter (ed. cit., 466): "In loco autem ubi erat palacium imperatoris, ad memoriam tante rei et ad honorem beati Pauli, facta est solemnis ecclesia sancti Pauli maioris." The *Cronaca* adds that this church was originally the temple founded by Tiberius Julius Tarsus (as asserted in the *Cronaca* chapter 7). Duke Anthino's role in founding this church is noted in the *Gesta episcoporum Neapolitanorum* (ed. cit., 428): "in ipsis igitur diebus Anthimus Neapolitanorum consul ad honorem sancti Pauli amplam construxit ecclesiam."

#### Chapter 52 (54B)

The source for these two deeds of the bishop and saint Athanasius I (r. 850–872) is the *Vita Athanasii* of the tenth century: "Insula Salvatoris vocabulo cognominata ... quamquam multis retro annis a monachis in cellis consistentibus in propria singulari voluptate incoheretur, illic frequenter properans, crebra exortatione illos ammonens, unum super illis

vice pastoris in coenobio degentibus abbatem constituit, qui eos regulari sub districtione fovet, ad quorum cotidianos sumptus ecclesiam beatae Luciae martiris in perpetuum concessit abendam cum omnibus rebus suis. In ecclesia namque sanctissimi ac beatissimi martiris Ianuarii ante sepius memoratae urbis moenia condita, quae Magna a civibus nuncupatur, ubi ante unus tantummodo excubabat obsequium, ipse monasterium instituit sub abbatis dumtaxat tuitione illicque religiosae vitae virum singularem patrem ordinavit.” See G. Waitz, ed., *Vita Athanasii episcopi neapolitani*, in *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum*, 439–449, at 444. The *Cronaca* culls only these two deeds from the much more detailed *Vita*. The pope whose reign here serves as a temporal marker was Hadrian II, who ruled from 867 to 872. The *anno domini* date 835 given in the *Cronaca*, and all variants on this date (735, 745, 832, 935) are obviously in error.

#### Chapter 53 (55B)

The source for this chapter is the *Ex miraculis Sancti Agrippini*, ed. G. Waitz, in *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum*, 463–465. The *Cronaca* omits most of the prayers and biblical citations of the original. Further, where the *Ex miraculis* says simply that the Neapolitans prayed to Januarius and Agrippinus for protection from the Saracens as the saints had protected Naples from the eruptions of Vesuvius, the *Cronaca* offers a more individualized story: that a hostage in prison, mourning the imminent defeat of Naples, was visited by a vision of the two saints who consoled him that God would not let Naples be lost. This may represent an adaptation of the second miracle recounted in the *Ex miraculis*, for here too the saints console a mourning Neapolitan, although otherwise the details are different.

All manuscript copies except PL describe Januarius and Agrippinus (Arpino) as “of Naples, of the piazza of Forcella.” This description properly applies only to Agrippinus, long associated with the neighborhood of Forcella where a church dedicated to him existed from the ninth century. Agrippinus was a third-century bishop of Naples. Januarius, also bishop of Naples in the late third – early fourth century, was probably originally from Benevento; legend records his martyrdom in Pozzuoli under the emperor Diocletian circa 305. Pope John XII, in whose reign this Saracen attack is set, ruled from 955 to 964.

### Chapter 54 (56B)

The Carolingian rulers mentioned in this chapter are Lothar (d. 855), Charles the Bald (d. 877) and Louis (d. 876). Pope Gregory IV reigned from 827 to 844. The *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum* (ed. cit., 433–434) recounts what appears to be the same event, noting that Lothar, king of the Franks, with Neapolitan help, repelled a Saracen attack on the Tyrrhennian coast, and “interea Salvatoris omnipotentia ... tempestivam excitavit procellam in puppes tantae superviae naufragium comminantes.” If the *Gesta* was Bartolomeo’s source, he did not follow it closely: the *Gesta* offers much more detail, and locates the event in the reigns of the eastern emperor Michael and the Neapolitan duke Sergius. The prayer is not found in this source.

The Group B manuscripts identify the pope instead as Leo IV (r. 847–855). This variant seems to be the Group B progenitor’s effort at greater historical accuracy: Leo’s reign overlaps more with those of the Carolingian rulers mentioned, and the Saracen attack in question occurred well after Gregory’s pontificate. (It is probably that of 846, which did end with the Saracen fleet’s destruction at sea: see Barbara Kreutz, *Before the Normans*, 26–28). It is likely, however, that “Gregory IV” is the original reading. The previous paragraph of the *Gesta* identifies pope Gregory as then ruling—a concordance that further suggests the *Gesta* was a source for this legend—and another source that Bartolomeo certainly consulted, the *Vita Athanasii* (ed. cit., at 441) speaks of pope Gregory, Lothar, and Louis together as men with whom Athanasius I was “familiarissimus,” which would make the event’s association with Gregory yet more plausible to our author.

### Chapter 55

The subject of this chapter is narrated in the *Liber de apparitione sancti Michaelis in Monte Gargano* (ed. G. Waitz, in *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum*, 540–543). The translation in the *Cronaca* is not particularly close to this source. As noted in Chapter Four at n. 30, a narration regarding the “apparition” of S. Michael was also part of the *SMP*. Because G.M. Monti provided only the title of this narration in his edition of the *SMP* and no manuscripts of the *SMP* are now available, we cannot compare its text to the *Cronaca*’s narration, but it seems likely, given the *Cronaca*’s many faithful borrowings from this source, that this chapter too derives from it.

*Chapter 56 (58B)*

I know of no textual source for this list of the regions of southern Italy and their lords before the Norman unification of the realm. The terminology employed is distinctively Angevin (for instance, mention of the county of Molise, which was a new administrative district created by this dynasty). Given this chapter's attention to individual, if unnamed, counts, it may relate to the *Cronaca's* later lists of counts ennobled by the first three Angevin kings, and derive from the same source, possibly Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa's own perusal of relevant documents in the royal treasury where he worked.

*Chapter 57 (59B)*

Several of the facts recorded here can be found in the *Romualdi salernitani chronicon*: the eleven brothers of Robert Guiscard (Romuald names all twelve brothers); Robert's marriage to Sichelgaita, sister of count Gisulf of Salerno; his role as leader of all Normans in the region; and his investiture in 1059 as duke by Pope Nicholas II. See the edition by L. Muratori in *RIS*, vol. 7, part 1 (Milan, 1723–1738, reprinted with updated editorial apparatus by C.A. Garufi [Città del Castello, 1914–1935]), where the cited passages appear on 183–185.

*Chapter 58 (60B)*

Robert's foundation of S. Matteo in Salerno is mentioned in the *Romualdi salernitani chronicon* (ed. cit., 189), but the other Norman foundations are not. Mention of Robert's construction of S. Lorenzo in Aversa may be original, with most manuscripts committing a *saut de même au même* on "Aversa." The datum is mentioned in manuscript PL in mid-chapter, and was added at the end of the chapter in manuscript SN<sub>1</sub>, whose copyist may also have committed a *saut* and then corrected himself.

*Chapter 59 (61B)*

This chapter is an abridgement of the *Romualdi salernitani chronicon*, ed. cit., 191–196. A few details have been changed: Romuald speaks of Robert's exploits "in ultramarinis partibus" but not specifically in

Bulgaria; he has Robert escorting the pope to Salerno, not Benevento. The *Cronaca's* "Casopoli o viro Casola" is in Romuald the "insula Casiopam," site of Robert's death; his age at death is given in Romuald as "maior sexagenario," and the year, correctly, as 1085. Robert's attempts to conquer the Byzantine empire stretched from 1081 to 1083, when he was called to Rome by pope Gregory VII, at that time besieged by emperor Henry IV.

### Chapter 60 (62B)

Immediately following the account of Robert Guiscard's death, the *Romualdi salernitani chronicon* mentions the succession of his son Roger Borsa (ed. cit., 197). The *Cronaca*, however confuses this Roger with the future Roger II, son of Count Roger of Sicily, for it is the latter's death and burial, as recounted in Romuald at 205, that are here translated very closely: "Rogerius dux morbo detentus Salerni diem clausit extremum mense Februarii anno ducatus sui XXV<sup>o</sup> mense VI etatis vero sue L<sup>o</sup>, sepultusque est in ecclesia beati Mathei apostoli quam pater eius in eadem civitate construxerat." Roger Borsa's childless successor William (duke of Apulia and Calabria, 1111–1127), William's investiture of Roger II with his lands, and William's death in Salerno at age 30, in the 18th year of his reign, are facts all found in Romuald at 213. Romuald correctly gives the year of William's death as 1127; however, the date 1125 is mentioned at the start of the same paragraph, which may explain its use in the *Cronaca*. The passage regarding King Roger II's conflicts with the pope appears in Romuald at 225: "Papa vero Innocentius ... magnum exercitum de romanis et campaninis congregavit, et terram regis ingressus, Sanctum Germanum et pene totam terram Sancti Benedicti occupavit, et Gallucium castrum obsedit. Quod audiens rex Rogerius Rogerium filium suum ducem Apulie contra eum cum magno exercitu misit."

The *Cronaca* Group A text concludes this chapter with brief mention of Roger II's investiture as king (recounted with similar brevity, immediately following the above-cited passage, in Romuald at 225) and the circumstances of his death, found in Romuald at 236: "... apud Panormum febre mortuus est, et sepultus in archiepiscopatu eiusdem civitatis, anno vite sue quinquagesimo octavo, mensibus duobus, diebus quinque, vicesimo septimo die mensis februarii, anno regni sui vicesimo IIII." Roger II, who had been count of Sicily from 1105 and duke of Apulia and Calabria

from 1127, was given the title of king of Sicily by the antipope Anacletus II in 1130, and was confirmed in this title by Pope Innocent II in 1139.

The Group B text offers a paraphrased and slightly longer account of Roger II's conflict with pope Innocent II and subsequent coronation (in 1139); more notably, it adds the story of Roger's two-year sojourn in Naples and the benefits bestowed on its citizens. For this divergent text, Group B follows the "Southernized Villani," chapter 8.

#### *Chapter 61A/63B*

The two versions of this chapter cover the same material, ultimately drawn from the *Romualdi salernitani chronicon* at 236–237, though the direct source for the *Cronaca* Group B text is the "Southernized Villani," chapter 9. Romuald's narration reads: "Fuit autem rex Rogerius statura grandis, corpulentis, facie leonina, voce subrauca, sapiens, providus, discretus, subtilis ingenio, magnus consilio, magis utens ratione quam viribus. In acquirenda pecunia multum sollicitus, in expendenda non plurimum largus, in publico ferus, in privato benignus, fidelibus suis honores et premia largiens, infidelibus contumelias et supplicia inferens. Erat suis subditis plus terribilis quam dilectus, grecis et sarracenis formidini et timori." As noted in Chapter Six above, the Group A text is here slightly more faithful to Romuald than is the "Southernized Villani"/*Cronaca* Group B version. Roger's peaceful reign and construction of a palace and gardens (in Palermo) are mentioned in Romuald at 232.

#### *62A/64B*

The ultimate source for this chapter is the *Romualdi salernitani chronicon*, ed. cit., 245–248, but Group B's slightly more detailed version derives from its immediate source, the "Southernized Villani" chapter 10. Whereas Romuald has King William I (1154–1166) show himself in the window of the Pisan Tower and his son Roger killed by an arrow to the eye in an unidentified location, both versions of the *Cronaca* conflate these two concurrent events, describing Roger as killed by an arrow while showing himself at this window. The embellishments that lengthen the Group B version may be said to distance it further from Romuald. In Group A's narration, for instance, the populace storms the palace where

King William is imprisoned; his son Roger is killed by an arrow in the process; and the king is freed. In the Group B version, the populace frees the king in part *because* his son was killed, “to lessen his paternal grief,” a notion with no correlate in Romuald.

William’s physical appearance and the circumstances of his death (found at the start of 62A, split between the start and the end of 64B) come from Romuald p. 253. Romuald gives William’s age at death as 46, the length of his reign as fifteen years and ten months, and the year of his death as 1166 (this final datum, omitted from Group A, is given as 1170 in Group B). In Romuald, William is described as “pulchra facie et decorus aspectu, corpore pinguis, statura sublimis, honoris cupidus et elatus, in preliis per mare et terram victoriosus, regno suo odibilis et plus formidini quam amori.” Again, Group A is slightly closer to the source, for instance in specifically mentioning William’s face and describing him as not only tall but “grosso” (corpore pinguis).

The added information at the end of Group B regarding Norman buildings in Naples comes, like the rest of 64B, from the “Southernized Villani,” chapter 10.

#### 63A (beginning)/65B

The source for both *Cronaca* versions of this narrative of William II (1166–1189) is the *Romualdi salernitani chronicon*, ed. cit., 254–255: “Quo defuncto W[ilhelmus] filius eius maior, natus annos duodecim, illi in regno successit .... Carceres aperuit, captivos plurimos liberavit, liberatis terras restituit, debita relaxavit, comites et barones, qui de regno exulaverant, revocavit in regnum, et eis terras sublatas reddidit .... Rex autem W[ilhelmus] propter multa beneficia que ipse et regina suo populo contulerunt, multum cepit a suis hominibus diligi et regnum suum in pace et tranquillitate tenere.” The *Romualdi salernitani chronicon* ends in 1178; thus the information on William II’s death (in 1189) must have come from a different source.

Group B’s slightly embellished version comes from the “Southernized Villani” chapter 11, though Group B offers a somewhat freer paraphrase of it than usual and omits the last two sentences of this chapter of the “SV.”

For the rest of chapter 63A see below.



## 66B–68B

As noted in the edition, the source for these chapters was the “Southernized Villani” chapters 12–14, themselves copies of Giovanni Villani’s *Nuova Cronica*, chapters VI: 1–3. All concern the career of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. Their titles, incipits and explicits are as follows. 66B: no title, inc. “Or dirremo chomo Federico Barbarosso fo electo imperadore,” expl. “E la cita di Roma fo liberata.” 67B: title “Chomo papa Alexandro ritornò in Ytalia et chomo in Lombardia hedificò la cita d’Alixandria per suo nomo,” inc. “Dopo stato il dicto papa Alexandro luongamente in Fransa,” expl. “et tolsegli la dignita dil palio et di la crocie, perche sempre fo chon Federico contro la ecclesia.” 68B: title “Como gl’imperador se riconciliò cho la chiesa et andò ultra mare al passaggio dov’egli mori,” inc. “Vedendosi gl’imperador Federico multo declinato di suo stato et signoria,” expl. “si tornò da Soria in ponente senza niuno acquisto fare.”

## 63A (cont.)/69B

There is no known source for this narration on Constance and Henry VI. The Group B version is largely a paraphrase of the Group A text. However, two sentences in the middle of 69B, from “Et è da savere” to “moglie vennero,” derive from the “Southernized Villani” chapter 16. (These sentences represent an original addition of the “SV” author to a chapter otherwise borrowed from Villani VI: 17.) Constance was the daughter of Roger II. She was married to Henry VI in 1186. The future Frederick II was born in 1194 in Jesi, on 26 December, which is the feast of S. Stephen. Shortly after William II’s death in November 1189, a portion of the population of southern Italy chose Tancred, an illegitimate grandson of Roger II, as their king in place of Constance and Henry VI. Henry VI’s first attempted conquest of the realm, in 1191, was unsuccessful; after Tancred’s death in February 1194 Henry entered the kingdom again and was crowned king in December. If one dates from the death of William II, Tancred reigned somewhat less than five years (the length given in the *Cronaca* 69B) and certainly not ten, as stated in the *Cronaca* 63A. Henry VI and Constance ruled southern Italy from December 1194 until Henry’s death in September 1197 and Constance’s death in November 1198.

*63A (end) – 65A (middle)/ 70B*

There is no known source for this narrative, which concerns the career of Frederick II. The Group B version reorganizes several passages from the Group A text, to which it adds original narrative. Specifically, most of sentence 3 of 70B comes from *Cronaca* 64A; sentence 4 appears at the end of *Cronaca* 63A; the end of sentence 7, from “fo disposto” to “Magdalena,” matches the start of *Cronaca* 65A, while the final sentence reorganizes the same information found at the end of *Cronaca* 63A.

Frederick was crowned king of Sicily in May 1198, shortly after his father’s death, aged about three and a half. He was crowned emperor in 1220, and crowned himself king of Jerusalem in 1229. Frederick had been excommunicated several times before, but was excommunicated and deposed by Innocent IV at the Council of Lyon (on the Rhône river) in 1245. He died on 13 December (the feast of Saint Lucy) 1250 at Castel Fiorentino in Basilicata.

*71B*

The source for this chapter is the “Southernized Villani” chapter 35, which largely reproduces Villani VII: 45 but adds the details found here about Pope Innocent IV’s death (7 December 1254) and his burial in Naples. 71B’s borrowing begins with a phrase already in Villani, and continues with the new information added by the “SV.” The Group B text also misplaces the event in the reign of Frederick II. The “SV,” following Villani, places it in the reign of his son Conrad, which is closer. Conrad died in the same year, but six months before Innocent IV.

*65A (end)/ 72B*

The second half of chapter 65A offers an account of Frederick’s son and successor Conrad, as does chapter 72B. Conrad IV became king of Sicily on his father’s death in 1250 and ruled until his death in May 1254; he besieged and conquered Naples in October 1253, which event is the central action of this section of text in both *Cronaca* versions. The more detailed account in 72B is drawn from the “Southernized Villani” chapter 34, which corresponds largely to Villani VII: 44. Compared to Villani, the “SV” however substitutes a different and slightly longer account of Conrad’s siege of Naples in mid-chapter and adds a new anecdote about

Conrad's spy at the end. Both these additions are reproduced back-to-back in 72B, which adds its own introductory 1.5 sentences and its own vernacular translation of the spy's verses at the end.

### 73B

This chapter weaves together four sentences or phrases borrowed from *Cronaca* 67A on the beginning of Charles of Anjou's career in southern Italy and a paraphrase of Charles I's battle against ten opponents at the Battle of Benevento from *Cronaca* 69A. (It will cover these events in much more detail in chapters 76–77B and 80–88B, which it borrows directly from the “SV.”) Its list of Charles' four enfeoffments also comes from 69A. This chapter adds more detail on Manfred that echoes without closely following “SV” chapter 35 (for instance, describing Manfred as *balio* of Conrad and noting the Church's opposition to him) and a list of the knights accompany Charles of Anjou to Italy that is original. It anachronistically divides the feudal dues Charles promised to the papacy between the “kingdom” and “Trinacria,” i.e. between the mainland and the island of Sicily; this division only occurred after the rebellion of the island of Sicily in 1282. According to Émile Léonard (*Les Angevins de Naples* [Paris, 1954], 52–53, 57), Charles was originally to pay 10,000 ounces to the papacy as feudal dues for the kingdom, later reduced to 8,000. Charles I and his army entered the kingdom in February 1266, not 4 November 1265. See also below under “67A” and “69A” for historical notes on these events.

### 66A/74B

Manfred, half-brother of Conrad IV, had ruled Sicily as regent for Conrad's infant son Conradin since Conrad's death in 1254, though excommunicated and much opposed by the papacy. False rumors of Conradin's death circulated in 1258, and led to Manfred's coronation in Palermo in August; when the rumors were proven false he refused to abdicate, and ruled until his death at the Battle of Benevento in February 1266.

## 67A

Pope Clement IV's investiture of Charles of Anjou with the kingdom of Sicily occurred in July 1265. Charles entered the southern Italian kingdom in early February 1266, and not on 4 November 1265. Charles battled Manfred at Benevento on 26 February 1266 and died on 7 January 1285 in Foggia; thus if one counts his reign as beginning with his victory over Manfred in 1266, he did rule nineteen (just under twenty) years, and was buried in the Naples cathedral. Some of this information was already provided in the Group B version at chapter 73B and will be repeated again in the chapters culled directly from the "Southernized Villani" (specifically at chapter 76B).

In addition to Léonard (cited above in the notes to chapter 73B), useful sources on Charles I's career, especially the military exploits featured in the *Cronaca*, are Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers* (Cambridge, Eng., 1958) and, more briefly, David Abulafia, *The Western Mediterranean Kingdoms, 1200–1500* (London and New York, 1997), chapter 3.

## 75B–89B

As noted in the edition, these chapters are copies of the "Southernized Villani" chapters 38–52, themselves copies of Villani VII: 87–89, VIII: 1–10. They offer a detailed narrative of Charles I's conquest of the kingdom of southern Italy, with a few digressions (such as a chapter on Charles' father-in-law, the count of Provence Raymond Berengar), and can be considered the B version's major expansion of the original *Cronaca*'s chapter 67. The titles, incipits, and explicits are given from manuscript PL, with brief comments as necessary.

75B (= "SV" chapter 38, Villani VII: 87, lines 3–13, 24–44). No title, inc. "Co la soa coronacione il re Monfreda montò in grande stado," expl. "Chosi tosto mandò al dicto Monfreda la soa malediczione che quandegli se credeva essere in magior stato et signioria chomo inansi faremo mensione, tornò in puogho tempo a suo mal fine." The chapter concerns the career of Manfred Staufien and is a prelude to the following chapters' narration of Charles I. The "SV" and, following it, the *Cronaca* 75B omit a Villani passage in mid-chapter considered irrelevant to the main action (lines 14–23). Compared to the "SV," 75B adds one sentence in the middle and the final phrase, "tornò in puogho tempo a suo mal fine."

76B (= “SV” chapter 39, Villani VII: 88). Title “Chomo la ecclesia di Roma elesse Karlo conte d’Angio, re di Scilia et di Puglia, et campione,” inc. “Essendo il dicto papa una chola ecclesia chosi tribolati et diminoiti per la potensa dil re Monfreda et li electuri di la Magnia c’avano electi duo ri di romani, cio quel di Spagnia e quel d’Ingliterra et niuno avia potensa di passare in Ytalia,” expl. “et firmata la eleccione gli mandaron il dicreto et cio fo negli anni di xpo M CC LXIII.” Unusually, the first four lines of 76B match Villani, whereas the “SV” offers a slightly expanded account, naming the rival candidates for emperor. As noted in Chapter Six, the additional information found in the “SV” may represent a later interpolation in the copies I have consulted; this is the only instance I have found where the *Cronaca* B is more faithful than the “SV” to Villani’s narrative.

77B (= “SV” chapter 40, Villani VII: 89). Title “Chomo il conte Karlo d’Angio acceptò la signioria et la eleccione factagli dalla cchiesa,” inc. “Como la dicta eleccione fo portata in Fransa al dicto Karlo pel cardinale,” expl. “et la soa parte ghebelina era al di sopra in Thoscana et in Lombardia, onde soa venuta avia per niente.”

78B (= “SV” chapter 41, Villani VII: 90). Title “Incomensa ricontando chi fo il conte Ramondo Berlingieri di Provensa,” inc. “Po che’l nostro tractado nel capitolo di sopra a facta mensione et ricontato di la valente condama moglie che fo dil re Karlo et figliuola dil buon conte Ramondo Berlingieri di Provensa,” expl. “et may non se seppe donde se fosse ni dove s’andasse se no che per molti se extimò che fosse un santo huomo.”

79B (= “SV” chapter 42, Villani VII: 91). Title “Chomo in cielo apparve una stella cometa et di soe significacioni,” inc. “Negli dì di xpo M CC LXIII dil mese d’agosto si apparve in cielo una stella cometha,” expl. “Lasciarem dil papa et dil’altre novita di Ytalia impero che tucte segueron agli avvenimento dil decto Karlo et comensaremo l’octavo libro di questa cronicha ove si narra di la signioria et stato dil dicto re Karlo et di suo socciessori et le novita che.nde fuoron quasi per tucto’l mondo.”

80B (= “SV” chapter 43, Villani VIII: 1). Title “Chomensa l’octavo libro ove tracta di la venuta dil re Karlo di Puglia et di suo facti et di molti mutacioni che fuoron in Ytalia al suo tempo,” inc. “Karlo figliuol sicondo che fo di Loygi piacevole re di Fransa et nipote dil buon re Philippo suo avolo,” expl. “impero chey se guastò a tendere un valestro. Lasciarem alquanto di la progienie dil buon re Karlo et seguiremo nostra ystoria dil suo passaggio in Ytalia chon altre chuose consiguendo a quello.” Notably,

the “SV” and *Cronaca* both preserve the Villani chapter title referring to this as the start of “Book Eight” despite its inappropriateness in these new contexts.

81B (= “SV” chapter 44, Villani VIII: 2). Title “Como i ghelfi usciti di Fierenza ebene l’arme da papa Chiemento et seguieron il conte Karlo,” inc. “In questi tempi i ghelfi usciti di Fierenza et dill’altre terre di Thoscana,” expl. “et fo di la miglior gente et che piu aoperasse in facto d’arme che nyuna altra c’avesse il conte Karlo dal suo lato contro a Monfreda. Lascieremo alquanto digli osciti ghelfi di Fierenza et dirremo di la venuta dil conte Karlo et di soa gente.”

82B (= “SV” chapter 45, Villani VIII: 3). Title “Como il conte Karlo se partì da Fransa et per mare passò da Provensa a Roma,” inc. “Negli anni di xpo M CC LXV Karlo conte d’Angio et di Provensa facta soa raunata di molti baroni et cavaliere fiancieschi et provensali et di moneta per finir suo passaggio,” expl. “in dil qual soggiorno provedì et ordinò chomo podesse intrare nel regnio chon soa hoste.”

83B (= “SV” chapter 46, Villani VIII: 4). Title “Como il conte Guido di Monforte passò per Lombardia chola gente dil conte Karlo et venne a Roma,” inc. “Il conte Guido di Momforte chola cavallaria dil conte Karlo il quali era rimasto per guida cho la moglie dil conte Karlo,” expl. “et gionti che fuoron a Roma, il conte Karlo gli vide et ricievigli multo allegramente et chon grande honore.”

84B (= “SV” chapter 47, Villani VIII: 5). Title “Como il re Karlo fo coronado a Roma dil ryame di Puglia et di Scicilia et puosese chon soa gente a contrastar Momfreda,” inc. “Chomo la kavallaria dil conte Karlo fo gionta in Roma si intese a prendere la corona nel giorno di la epiphania,” expl. “Et habandonato il ponte di Cieperano non tornarono all’oste dil re Monfreda a San Germano ma intrarono in cierti lor castegli.”

85B (= “SV” chapter 48, Villani VIII: 6). Title “Como il re Karlo avuto il ponte di Cieperano ebbe per forza la terra di San Germano,” inc. “Como il re Karlo et soa hoste ebbon preso il passo di Cieperano, si pigliaron Aquino senza contrasto,” expl. “et quivi soggiornò il re Karlo et soa gente per pigliar riposo et per saver gli andamenti di Monfreda.”

86B (= “SV” chapter 49, Villani VIII: 7). Title “Como il re Monfreda ordinò et andò a Benivento et ischierosse per combactere,” inc. “Como il re Monfreda intese la novella di la pigliata di Sar Germano et tornandone

la soa gente sconficta,” expl. “et era di M CCCC kavalieri senza i pedoni e l’arcieri sarrayni i quay erano in gran quantita.”

87B (= “SV” chapter 50, Villani VIII: 8). Title “Como il re Karlo ordinò le schiere per combactere chon Monfreda,” inc. “Il re Karlo vedendo Monfredo et soa gente venoti a campo et ischierati per combactere,” expl. “et se avenesse a.lluy la vectoria ca diventarey amico di ghelfi et inimico di ghebellini.”

88B (= “SV” chapter 51, Villani VIII: 9). Title “Di la bactaglia che fo tra’l re Karlo e’l re Monfredo et como Monfredo fo sconficto e morto chon soa gente,” inc. “Ordinate le duo schiere di duo ri nel piano dila Grandella chomè decto di sovra,” expl. “questa bactaglia et iscomficta di Monfredo fo di venardi il sexto di frebayo negli anni di xpo M CC LXV.” Manuscript E divides this chapter into two.

89B (= “SV” chapter 52, Villani VIII: 10). Title “Como il re Karlo ebbe in tucto la signioria di Puglia et di Scicilia,” inc. “Como il re Karlo ebbe sconficto et morto Monfredo, la soa gente si fuoron tucti recchi dele spoglie dil campo,” expl. “[Onde Don Arrigo dixè, Pel cor de Dius, o il me macerà, o il mactrai. Lasciamo alquanto di facti del re Carlo et diremno de alcune altre cose le quali foron in questi tempi, e tornaremo a nostra materia].” The explicit is given in square brackets because it comes from manuscript E. Manuscript PL, which is missing a folio after fol. 56, lacks this part of the text.

#### 68A/90B

Chapter 68A briefly narrates Charles I’s victory over the young Conradin at the battle of Tagliacozzo (23 August 1268), and Charles’ execution of Conradin and some of his allies in Naples on 29 October. These events ensured Charles’ uncontested rule in the kingdom. The generals named here were Henry of Castile, brother of King Alfonso X of Castile; Frederick of Austria, also known as Frederick of Baden; and Gerardo di Donoratico of Pisa. The *Cronaca* is correct in stating that Henry was imprisoned for life while the other two were executed with Conradin. The monastery of S. Maria della Vittoria was founded by Charles I in 1274 at the site of the battle. Detailed accounts are found in Léonard, op. cit., 64–73, and Runciman, op. cit., 110–116.

Chapter 90B offers a much longer account of this battle. The first paragraph, ending “fo promesso per re Karlo,” follows very closely the “South-

ernized Villani” chapter 56. The second paragraph, from “Brievemente” to “puosti in isconficta,” summarizes the much longer account in the “SV” chapter 57, while the next three sentences (from “Corradino” to “la soa morte”) summarize information in the “SV” chapter 59. The next four sentences (from “Avuta la victoria” to “fe suo viaggio”) follow very closely the end of the same “SV” chapter 59. The next sentence (“Partito ... renditi”) paraphrases the end of “SV” chapter 57. The *Cronaca* B then adds the statement that only French monks could inhabit the monastery of S. Maria della Vittoria. The mention of Charles I’s construction of Castel Nuovo in Naples comes from the “SV” chapter 92. (This passage on the Castel Nuovo is an original addition of the “SV” to a chapter that otherwise follows Villani VIII: 95.) The “miser Alardo il Vecchio” discussed at length in 90B was Éradard de Valéry, chamberlain of the king of France and constable of Champagne; many contemporaries and later writers, including Dante, referred to him as “Alardo il Vecchio” and attributed Charles I’s victory to him.

The beginning of this chapter is given in the edition from manuscript E, because our base manuscript for the redacted *Cronaca*, PL, is missing a folio after that numbered 56 and hence lacks the start of this chapter (as well as the end of the previous chapter, 89B).

69A/90B (cont.)

The Group A text here summarizes Charles’ character and career, mentioning Charles I’s participation in the “war in Outremer” (presumably the 1248–1250 crusade to Damietta) led by his brother, King Louis IX of France (1226–1270), who was canonized in 1297. It also returns to Charles’ battle against Manfred at Benevento to provide an example of Charles’ valor: his self-defense against ten soldiers, led by Bernardo Castagna, who had vowed to kill him. (This example of Charles I’s valor is recorded, with much additional detail, in the Group B version at chapter 73B.)

The second half of chapter 69A tells of Charles’ campaign to conquer “Romania” (probably meaning the Byzantine Empire, and not the Balkans where Charles I did establish early control over the southern coast) and the rebellion of the island of Sicily in March 1282, known as the Sicilian Vespers, that scotched that campaign. See the bibliography cited in the notes to chapter 67A above. The list of four counts ennobled by Charles I probably derives from our author’s perusal of documents in the treasury where he worked.



The narrative regarding “Romania” and the Sicilian Vespers in chapter 69A matches up with the last paragraph of chapter 90B. The latter, however, borrows some details from the “Southernized Villani” chapter 68, e.g. the description of Giovanni di Procida (considered the instigator of the Sicilian Vespers) as undertaking an embassy, and his promise of the dominion of Sicily to Peter of Aragon. Giovanni di Procida was indeed a physician who had served the Staufen rulers of southern Italy, a fact the *Cronaca B* narrative adds. The *Cronaca B*’s list of Charles I’s enfeoffments comes from the “SV” chapter 60. (The “SV” had itself borrowed this list from the *Cronaca A*, but added a description of the count of Marsico as “valiant in his person,” which added phrase is found in this chapter of the *Cronaca B*).

## 70A

Here the Group A text repeats mention of the Sicilian Vespers of 1282. Peter III of Aragon (1276–1285) was married in 1262 to Constance, daughter of Manfred Staufen, and had plans to invade the kingdom of Sicily for which he utilized the services of Giovanni di Procida. After the uprising in Sicily in March 1282, he sailed there in August to be the Sicilians’ champion against Angevin efforts to retake the island. See the bibliography cited in the notes to chapter 67A above.

## 71A/91B

The *Cronaca* Group A here offers detailed and correct information on Charles II, possibly drawn from Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa’s own perusal of royal documents in the treasury, or from his own or others’ memory. Charles II’s reign is sometimes dated from his release from captivity in 1289; if dated from the death of his predecessor in 1285, Charles II did rule 24 years, and died on 5 May 1309, as stated here in the *Cronaca A* and in chapter 93 of the B version. His heart was buried in the Dominican church of S. Domenico in Naples, while the rest of his body was transferred to Notre Dame de Nazareth in Aix-en-Provence.

The *Cronaca* Group B borrows its second and third sentences from the “Southernized Villani” chapter 92, to which the Group B text adds the last phrase “im private elemosine.” The Group B text correctly identifies Charles II as the founder of Notre Dame de Nazareth in Aix, of S. Pietro a Castello in Naples and of S. Luigi Re di Francia in Aversa.

## 72A/92B

This chapter, listing the children of Charles II, has a complex genealogy. The original *Cronaca* (A) lists nine sons and five daughters, and describes their mother, Maria of Hungary, at the end of the chapter. Giovanni Villani's *Nuova Cronica* VIII: 95 also listed Charles II's children, naming their mother first and including only seven sons and no daughters. The "Southernized Villani" chapter 92 is largely a copy of Villani VIII: 95, but for this list of Charles II's children it melded Villani's version with that of *Cronaca* A: naming the mother Maria first, as did Villani, and using largely the same titles for the sons as did Villani, but including nine sons and five daughters as did *Cronaca* A. *Cronaca* 92B, in its turn, represents a fusion of *Cronaca* A and the "SV" (see, for example, its identification of the sixth son, where it appears to correct errors in both the two works it drew from) while revising or adding detail of its own. This is best illustrated via a chart, found at the end of this appendix. The sixth and seventh sons, given as John and Tristan in the B version (Thomas and Tristan in the A version), are treated as a single person ("John Tristram") in Steven Runciman's genealogy; if they were two they both died young. The eldest daughter, given in both versions of the *Cronaca* and in the "SV" as Clemence, should be Margaret. She was married to Charles of Valois, father of King Philip VI of France, as the *Cronaca* A correctly states. The *Cronaca* B, following the "Southernized Villani," instead identifies Charles of Valois as son of Philip IV of France, though Charles was in fact Philip IV's brother. For genealogical charts, see Runciman, *op. cit.*, after 338, and Caroline Bruzelius, *The Stones of Naples. Church Building in Angevin Italy, 1266–1343* (New Haven, 2004), before the introduction.

## 73A/93B

Both the *Cronaca* 73A and 93B here describe Charles II and his deeds, and list the subjects he ennobled. The "Southernized Villani" chapter 123 borrowed from the *Cronaca* A to note Charles' construction of the wharf (*molo*) and his concession of the "gabella del buon denaro," and to list the same six counts he ennobled. *Cronaca* B here opens with 4.5 original sentences on Charles II's good character. It then cites exactly from "SV" chapter 123 on Charles' general elevation of subjects and good deeds toward Naples. In the following list of six counts, it follows the "SV" in adding a small detail not found in the original *Cronaca* (describing

Boniface VIII as of “glorious memory”), and includes the same passage, original to the “SV,” mentioning the Signulfo brothers among the list of subjects Charles II raised up. On these brothers, see Chapter Three at nn. 26–27. The last three sentences of 93B, on Charles’ death and burial, contain information also found in *Cronaca* 71A and in “SV” 123 (which again doubtless borrowed from the original *Cronaca*), but *Cronaca* B here is closer in its sequence and detail to *Cronaca* A.

74–75A/94–95B

In both versions of the *Cronaca*, this pair of chapters is devoted to King Robert (1309–1343) and the succession of his granddaughter and heir Joanna I (1343–1382). The *Cronaca* B adds a good deal more information on Robert and on his son Charles, duke of Calabria (d. 1328), the father of Joanna I. Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa, writing no later than 1350, could not know of Louis of Taranto’s coronation by pope Clement VI (which occurred in 1354), but the author of the redacted version could and did.

The precise and largely correct figures for Robert’s date of death, length of reign, and age at death given in the original, Group A version suggest that Bartolomeo Caracciolo was again drawing on official documents, perhaps related to his work in the treasury, or his own recent memory. Robert did indeed rule for thirty-three years, eight months, and fifteen days, counting from the death of his father Charles II on 5 May 1309 to Robert’s own on 20 January 1343. (The year 1344 given in our base manuscript and several others is doubtless a scribal error; three manuscripts have the correct year, 1343.) Robert’s year of birth is usually given as 1274, whence he would have been 68 years old at his death, as the *Cronaca* A asserts. Angevin forces fought for Guelf allies in Tuscany and Genoa, and waged ongoing attempts to recover the island of Sicily, as our author notes. The imperial invasions mentioned are those of Henry VII in the early 1310s and of Ludwig of Bavaria in the late 1320s, neither of which succeeded in entering the Angevin kingdom. The loss of the royal archives from Robert’s reign makes it difficult to confirm the list of counts he enfeoffed, but presuming that this information comes from records Bartolomeo consulted, it may be (taking into account subsequent scribal error) rather reliable.

The Group B version of the text adds much detail on Robert’s career, also largely reliable. Robert and his forces did indeed “subjugate” Genoa

in the sense that the Genoese Guelfs named Robert their lord for a number of years in thanks for his aid in repelling Genoese Ghibellines. Regarding the threatened imperial invasions, however, it identifies Henry VII (of Luxembourg) as “of Bohemia,” perhaps confusing Henry with John of Bohemia, who gained control of a number of north Italian towns and aspired to the imperial crown in the early 1330s, but was not a serious threat to Robert’s kingdom. The Group B version correctly notes Charles of Calabria’s leadership of an Angevin army in Florence aimed at stopping the attempted invasion by Ludwig of Bavaria (1328). In 1333 Andrew, son of Charles Robert (a.k.a. Carobert), the king of Hungary, was betrothed to Robert’s granddaughter, the future Joanna I. The Group B text is accurate in its list of the religious foundations made by Robert and (principally) by his queen, Sancia of Majorca (d. 1345). For a recent survey of the events of Robert’s reign see Samantha Kelly, *The New Solomon. Robert of Naples (1309–1343) and Fourteenth-Century Kingship* (Leiden, 2003).

#### 96B

In this chapter, the Group B version of the *Cronaca* adds the tale of the murder of Joanna I’s first husband Andrew of Hungary, which occurred in Aversa in September 1345, and of the avenging invasion of Andrew’s brother Louis of Hungary from May 1347 to May 1348. Charles, duke of Durazzo, was executed by King Louis of Hungary in Aversa in early 1348. On these events see Léonard, *op. cit.*, 344–360.

the children of charles ii: relation of the two versions of the  
chronaca and their sources (for appendix i at notes to 72a [92b])

<i>Cronaca A</i> chapter 72	Villani VIII: 95	“SV” chapter 92	<i>Cronaca B</i> chapter 92
Lo sopradicto re Carlo habe figlyoli XIII de li quali ne foro masculi nove et femene V	Ebbe piu figliuoli della prenzessa sua moglie figliuola e reda del re d’Ungaria	Habe pyu figlyoli et herede dela prencepessa sua molgere figlyola et herede delo re de Ungaria chyamata madamma Maria	Hebbe il decto re Karlo sighondo per moglie Maria figliola primogenita dill’inclito re d’Ungaria, la qual socciese al regnio d’Ungaria dopo la morte dil padre et fo chyamata regina d’Ungaria. Di la quale il decto Karlo ebbe nove figliuoli mascholi et cinque femine.
Carlo Martello lo quale era chyamato re de Ungaria	Carlo Martello che poi fu re d’Ungaria	Carlo Martello lo quale fo intitulato re de Ungaria	Karlo Martello primogenito il quale fo intitulato re d’Ungaria
sancto Luyse de Francia	Lois che se rende frate minore e poi fu vescovo di Tolosa	Luyse lo quale per virtu de Dio et de soy bone opere se rendio frate minore et poy viscopo de Tolsa	Lodovico il quale per virtu di Dio et di soe bone operacioni fo sancto
re Ruberto	Ruberto duca di Calavra	Roberto duca de Calabria lo quale fo poy re de Sicilia	Roberto re di Sicilia
Philippo principe de Taranto	Filippo prenze di Taranto	Philippo princepe de Taranto	Philippo prinziepe di Tharanto
Raymundo Berlengiere	Ramondo Berlinghieri conte dovea essere di Proenza	Raymundo Berlengiere che conte dovea essere de Provenca	Ramondo Berllingieri rigiente di la Vicaria dil ryame.

<i>Cronaca A</i> chapter 72	Villani VIII: 95	<i>Cronaca B</i> chapter 92
Thomasi lo quale fo clerico et morì piczulo infante	Gianni prenze della Morea	Giovanni il quale fo chierico et morto piczolo infante di diece anni
Tristano che nassò quando lo patre era presone et morì iovene infante.	Piero conte d'Eboli	Tristano il quale fo nato in tristicia, che suo patre era in pregione a Raghona in quel tempo, che fo pigliato dal re di Rahona in bactaglia di navilii ad un luogho presso di Napoli il quale se chiyama il Capo d'Ansi. Il quale misser Tristano finio la soa vita in dell'anno septimo di la soa eta.
l'anne principe de la Morea		Misser Giovanni prinzepe di Acaya et successive duca di Durazo
Pietro conte de Gravina		Misser Pietro conte di Gravina il quale morì molto iovene
Clemenza la quale fo mogliere de messere Carlo lo patre de re Philippo de Francia che ene mo		Clemenza la quale fo moglie di misser Karlo primogenito dil re di Fransa il quale fo chiyamato re Philippo li bello
		narrato chiyamato Philippo lo Bello

Cronaca A chapter 72	Villani VIII: 95	“SV” chapter 92	Cronaca B chapter 92
Byancha et fo moglyere de lo re Iacobo de Rahona	Byancha et fo moglyere de lo re Iacobo de Rahona	Byanca moglyere che fo de lo re Giamo de Rahona	Biancha moglie dil re di Roghona
Alienora et foy moglyere de dopn Federico lu quale se faceva chyamare re de Cicilia	Helyanora moglyere ch� de lo signore de Trinaci chyamato don Federico de Rahona fratello de lo sopradictio re Giamo de Rahona	Helyanora moglyere ch� de lo signore de Trinaci chyamato don Federico de Rahona fratello de lo sopradictio re Giamo de Rahona	Elinora moglie dil signior di Trinacria il quale se chiamo Federico di Raghona.
Maria che fo moglyere de lo re de Maiorica	Maria che fo moglyere de lo re de Maiorica	Maria moglyere che fo de lo re de Mayolica	Maria moglie dil re di Mayorica
Viatrice la quale fo moglyere primaramente de lo marchese de Ferrara et da poy de lo conte Scagiuso	Beatrice moglyere che fo de lo marchese de Monferrato et poy la secunda volta fo moglyere de messere Berteraymo de lo Balczo conte de Monte Scagiuso; la tercza volta fo data per muglyere ad missere Uberto dalfine de Vienna	Beatrice moglyere che fo de lo marchese de Monferrato et poy la secunda volta fo moglyere de messere Berteraymo de lo Balczo conte de Monte Scagiuso; la tercza volta fo data per muglyere ad missere Uberto dalfine de Vienna	Viatrice primo moglie dil marchese di Ferrara. La secunda volta fo moglie di misser Bertheraymo dil Balso conte di Monte Scagioso di la qual nascio madamma [ <i>space left blank for two words</i> ]; la terza volta fo data per moglie a misser Uberto dalfino di Vienna.
Tucti li sopradicti figli et figlye habe lo sopradictio re de madamma la regina Maria figlya de lo re de Ungaria soa muglyere			

## appendix ii

### VARIANT TEXT OF MANUSCRIPT V

Manuscript V diverges notably and uniquely from all other manuscripts after chapter 56, first by repeating, with some variation, the content of chapter 56 in list form, then condensing, rearranging, and paraphrasing remaining contents of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, with many omissions. These variants being such as to constitute virtually a third version of the text, the whole text of V is given here starting with the second, list form of chapter 56.

#### 56V (cont.)

Prima che lo regno di Scicilia fosse stato unito, era diviso in multi parti et in multi dominii pro ut inferius audietur.

Primo et principale la cita de Napoli era socto lo imperio de Constantinopoli.

La cita de Surrento havea uno signore che se intitulava dompno Surrento.

La cita de Amalfi con tucto lo suo distretto havea uno duca;

La citate de Salerno havea uno principe che era signore del Principato Citra et Ultra.

In Callabria Citra et Ultra era uno duca.

In Terra de Otranto era uno signore che se intitulava principe de Taranto.

In Terra de Bari era uno signore che se faceva intitulare principe de Bari.

In Capitanata incommenzando da Troya era uno signore che se intitulava duca di Puglia.

Nel Monte Sancto Angelo et soy pertinentie era uno signore che se intitulava dello Honore de lo Sancto Angelo signore.

In Apruczo Citra et Ultra erano diversi signori, cio è lo conte de Alba, lo conte de Sangro, lo conte de Manapello, lo conte de Cellano, lo conto de Lorito, et alcuni altri signori.

In dello contato de Moles era uno conto.



In Terra de Lavore era uno signore lo quale se intitulava principe de Capua allo quale erano subiecti lo conti di Fundi et lo conti de Cuserta.

La insula de Cicilia alcuno fiato fo socto lo imperio de Constantinopoli et alcuna volta socto lo dominio de lo re de Affrica. Ma poi che Roberto Guiscardo lo conquistò, lo donò ad Rogiere suo fratello et intitulao conte de Cicilia.

## 57V

Roberto Guiscardo et lo conte Rogieri predicti forono de Normandia et vennero in Ytalia chiamati et per soldati dello principe de Capua lo quale facea guerra con lo principe de Salerno. Anno vero domini M LV lo dicto Roberto fo facto capitano generale da tucti li normani et da.lloro giente d'arme. Et d'allora incommenzao ad diffare et caczare tucti li predicti signori da.lloro signoria et acquistare lo regno di Sicilia. Et fecese intitulare duca de Puglia et de Callabria per papa Nicolao de Bavera. Lo quale Roberto vixè in sua signoria anni XXVII, moriò in Romania nell'isola de Casopoli de naturale morte. Lo quale era gia in etate de anni 50. Lo quale Roberto et suoy successori forono catholici xpiani et hedificaro di multe ecclesie, hospitale, et castelle, fra la qual hedificò la ecclesia de Sancto Mazeo de Salerno, la Trinitate de Venosa, et lo castello de Melffo et multi altri diversi ecclesie et castelle. Anchora ipso Roberto passao in Romania et conquistò per fin ad Constantinopoli et combactiò con la giente dello imperatore et appe la victoria et poy andò in lo regno de Vulgaria et assediò lo imperatore de Vulgaria multo strectamente. Allo quale stando in quillo assedio andaro sollempni ambasciatori da papa Gregorio lo quale era assediato in lo castello de Sancto Angelo dallo imperatore Henrico et dallo populo de Roma ad pregado che dovesse venire et darli securso per che altro ayuto non securso potea havere. De che lo dicto Roberto lassò in quello assedio assembramento suo figlio et ipso se ne vene in Puglia com parte del suo exercito ove congregato grande numero de giente d'arme, et pedoni assay, et congregata questa giente pigliò lo camino in verso Roma. Per la quale cosa lo imperatore fugiò et lo dicto Roberto liberao lo predicto papa et conduxelo ad Benivento. Ma prima che se partesse da Roma ebbe lo dominio plenariamente. Poi di questo pigliaio per moglie Setregayta sorella del princepe de Salerno lo quale principe in processo di tempo moriò senza herede pero socesse lo dicto Roberto allo dicto principe. La cita de Napoli non mai. Poy la sua morte fo signore Rogieri suo figliolo et vixè in suo dominio anni XXVI et moriò

in etate de anni L in Salrno et fo seppellito in della ecclesia de Sancto Mazeo de Salerno apostolo. Lo quale Rogiere successe Guglielmo<sup>1</sup> suo figliolo, lo quale vixe anni 27 et moriò in Salerno et fo sepellito in della dicta ecclesia de Sancto Matheo et quando moriò era de etate de anni 30, et moriò senza herede. Allo quale duca Guglielmo successe lo conte Rogieri de Sicilia lo quale era stato nipote carnale del dicto Roberto. Lo quale duca Guglielmo lo fece suo herede. Et quisto conte Rogieri poy fece fare et incoronare re dali regnicoli per la quale cosa papa Anacleto fece congregare gran giente de romani et de campanini et vene personalmente contra lo dicto re Rogieri et pigliò San Germano con tucte le altre castelle de Monte Cassino. Poy fece assedia Galluczo. Contra lo quale papa lo re Rogieri mandò lo duca Rogieri suo figliolo con gran parte del suo exercito li quali pigliaro lo papa et li cardinali et assay altri di. llo ro giente. Per la quale cosa venuto poy ad concordia lo papa predicto ionse lo per bandera lo regno di Sicilia. Lo quale re Rogieri visse in suo dominio anni 24 et in Palermo se moriò de anni 48 et fo sepellito in della maiore ecclesia.

## 58V

Quisto re Rogieri fo iustissimo principe de terribile aspecto de suc-tile intellecto et prosperoso di sua persona. In presentia del populo monstrava regisca ma era multo clementissimo. Era enemichissimo alli saracini et alli greci. Questo sempre tenne lo suo stato et lo suo dominio in gran iustitia et fece in Sicilia di multi et diversi ecclesie et altri castelle et pallaczi. Lo quale habe in suo tempo la citate de Napoli. Allo quale re Rogieri successe re Guglielmo suo figlio et quisto vixe in sua signoria anni XV et moriò in Palermo in etate de anni XLVI. Lo quale fo grande de persona, fo virtuoso in bactaglia questo perche era multo exoso allo populo fo pigliato et inpresonato in Palermo et dirroppato dal suo palazzo et alcuni conti et baroni che erano in presoni in Palermo forono liberati. Questo per che era re non fo odiato per altro dalli soy popoli se non che applaudeva multo et sequitava la voluntate e lo consiglio de uno che havea nome Mayo de Baro miraglio del regno di Sicilia. Li quali possero con loro malvagii consigli la insula de Sicilia in grande scandalo et divisione. Facta questa novita in della persona del dicto rey, lo populo de Palermo lo fece cavalcare per la cita lo duca di Puglia che era figliolo del prefato re, lo quale se chiamava Rogieri, gridando tucto lo populo dicendo, Viva viva

---

<sup>1</sup> Guglielmo] *this name is always abbreviated Guglmo or Guglo*

lo nostro signore re Rogieri et mora lo re Guglielmo. Poy de tre giorni lo dicto populo tucti armati andaro et insultaro lo palaczo per volere fare morire lo re Guglielmo. De che lo dicto duca Rogieri parandose ad una fenestra del dicto pallazo per volere reingratiare lo populo, fo ferito de uno colpo de balestra in dell'ochio et fo morto. Morto lo dicto duca, subito lo dicto re Guglielmo fo liberato. Li conti e li baroni che erano stati causa de questo male tucti se fortificaro per loro castelle. Et per questo tanto in C[ic]ilia quanto in Calabria et in Puglia tenne sempre lo suo dominio in gran tribulacione. Et inpercio li fo necessario fare grande et assay vendecte. Quello che principalmente ordinasse questa mocione contra lo dicto re fo uno barone ciciliano che habe nome Matheo Bonella lo quale mano proprio occise lo prescripto amiraglio. Lo quale Matheo in processo di tempo fo ponito delle sue male operatione. Allo quale re Guglielmo successe re Guglielmo bono suo figlio lo quale era de anni XVI et vixे in suo dominio anni XVI. Lo quale moriò in Palermo senza herede. Questo fo clementissimo signore, lo quale in generale et particolare fece grandissime gratie et singolari beneficii alli suoy subdicti. Tenne lo suo dominio semper in gran quieta et pace et per questo ad differentia dello patre fo chiamato et dicto lo re bono Guglielmo.

## 59V

Lo quale perdonao re Guglielmo ad omne persona et redusse ad sua gratia tucti li conti et baroni che erano stati scazati et inpresonati per lo re Guglielmo suo patre. Alli quali fece rendere tucti loro terre et castella et sempre che vixе, tenne le suoy populi senza farli gravezza alcuna. Morto quisto re Guglielmo sucesse la regina Constanzia figliola del predicto re Rogieri la quale era stata monacha in Palermo. Per concessione et spirituale gratia dallo papa fo assoluta dalla religione et data per moglieri allo imperatore Arrico de casa de Suavia. Della quale dompna nascea Friderico alla citate de Esu anno domini M C XLVIII in die beati Sthephani.

## 60V

Questo imperatore non pote ottenere lo regno di Sicilia perche Trancredo figliolo bastardo del duca Rogieri figliolo dello Rogieri con voluntate et consentimento delli conti et de li baroni tenne lo regno occupato et fo facto et intitolato re. Lo quale vixе et regnò anni V.

## 61V

Morto quisto re Trancredo, vene lo dicto imperatore con la regina Constanca et ottenuto lo dicto regno anno domini M CC. Lo quale imperatore vixè in suo dominio anni IIII et moriò nella cita de Messina et fo seppellita nella maiore ecclesia de Palermo. La dicta regina di poy pocho tempo moriò ad Messina et fo ancha sepellito in Palermo.

## 62V

Questo predicto imperatore tiraneschamente pigliò multi conti et baroni deli quali alcuni fece acecare et mandòli in la Magna con loro moglieri et figlioli. Morta questa regina Constanca, sucesse Fridericho suo figliolo lo quale quando moriò lo patre era de anni V. Et questo vixè in signoria dello regno anni LI et dello imperio anni 32, et dello regno de Yerusalem anni 28. Lo quale Fredericho moriò in Puglia ad uno castello che se chiama Fiorentino et fo sepellito ancha in Palermo anno domini M CC LI in die beate Lucie.

## 63V

Vivente lo imperatore predicto, fece pigliare multi signori del regno de li quali alcuni ne fece impicare et alcuni ardere con loro moglieri. Ad questo predicto imperatore sucesse re Conrado suo figliolo lo quale vixè in dominio suo anni II et quisto assediò la cita de Napoli la quale poi per fama silli rendia con certi pacti contra li quali pacti per fece ruynare le mura della dicta citate et cazzare fora multi cittadini con tucta loro famiglia.

## 64V

Ad questo re Conrado sucesse fraudolente Manfredo suo fratello bastardo. Lo quale Manfredo fece venire lettere false et furtive dalla Magna dicendo Rado era morto. Lo quale contra la voluntate dello papa et della sancta ecclesia romana se fece fare et incoronare re per li conti et baroni dello regno et questo regnao in suo dominio anni dece.

## 65V

Vivente questo Manfredo, papa Innocentio quarto concesse lo regno de Sicilia ad misser Carlo fratello dello re de Franca lo quale venne in dello dicto regno con grande compagnia de francische et de provincani et de caliani et trovò lo re Manfredo appresso de Benivento con la sua gente ove fecero gran battaglia nella quale morì lo re Manfredo predicto. El dicto re Carlo hebbe la victoria et ottenne lo dicto regno anno domini M CC LXVI.

## 66V

Anno vero domini M CC LXXXV moria ad Foggia de Puglia et fo seppellita in della maiore ecclesia dello arcevescopato de Napoli.

## 67V

Per che lo dicto Karlo habe obtenuta lo dicto regno anni II in pace, venne Conradino figliolo del dicto re Conrado et menò con secho lo duca de Austria et altri gran signori dalla Magnia. Anchora menao dompno Henrico fratello dello re de Spagna con altri nobili homini spagnoli. Menao lo conte de Gado de Pisa et altri lombardi, toscani, et altri taliani per levare lo dicto regno al predicto Carlo. Donde lo re Carlo sentendo loro venuta andao con sua gente nelle confine del suo regno et scontròsse con li prenominati soy inimici in uno loco che ey chiamato et è nelle parte de Appruczo ove è ogie una abbadia che è dicta Sancta Maria della Victoria ove forono presi Conradino, lo duca de Austrie, dopno Heynrico predicto, lo conte Gado, et multi altri nobili homini de. loro compagnia li quali tucti mandao presoni ad Napoli dove ad petitione delle homini dello riame fece tagliare la testa allo predicto Conradino duca de Suavia et lo duca Astira, el conte Gado de Pisa et alcuni altri in poco numero. Lo predicto Henrico fratello del re Spagna fo posto in presone in Castello del Monte di Sancta Maria in Terra de Bari.

## 68V

Fo lo re Karlo primo cavaliere multo strenuo ardito et virtuoso et portase allo passaggio alla guerra de ultra mare dove fo sancto Loys re de

Francza suo fratello multo meglio che nullo altro. Et usavace grande prudentia et prodecza de sua persona in della bactaglia de soy colo re Manfredro se portao tanto valentemente che dove li foro addosso V cavalieri delle migliori de l'oste che havevano iurato la sua morte et defesese in tale manera che non appe nullo dampno et alcuni delli cavalieri foro morti et prese. Lo caporale dalli dicti cavalieri fo misser Balardo Castagno ad presso alla bactaglia fo Coradino per sua bona compagnia de sua persona habe victoria de le suoy inimici. Anchora fo lo predicto re homo de grande cuore et poy che habe conquistato lo riame, fece fare uno apprehio de navili et de cavallaria per andare personalmente ad conquistare Romania et foro stato facto se non che lo impedìo la ribellione de Sicilia. La quale ribellione non facta per culpa dello re ma per culpa delle soy collateral li quali indebitamente spossediano li baroni dello riame delle loro terre et faceano a. lloro donare; etiam dio per culpa delli officiali indebitamente et per multe vie agravavano li homini dello riame. Lo sopradicto re Carlo in dello tempo della signoria fuorono in dello riame quatro conti, cio è misser Gualtieri conti de Brenda conti de Liza; misser Rogieri de Sancto Severino conte de Marsico; misser Pietro Ruffo de Cadanzano; misser Berthoraymo dello Balcio conte de Avellino.

69V<sup>2</sup>

Lo quarto fo misser Philipppo de Taranto principe.

Lo quinto fo misser Raymondo Berlinger.

Lo sexto fo misser Iohanni lo quali fo clerico et moriò garzon.

Lo septimo fo miser Tristayno lo quale nacque stando lo Karlo suo patre presone et ancha questo moriò multo giovenetto.

Lo viii<sup>o</sup> fo miser Pietro conte de Gravina.

Delle predicte dopne figliole dello dicto re:

La prima fo madama Clemencza la quale fo moglie de misser Carlo patre dello re Philipppo de Franza.

La 2<sup>a</sup> fo madonna Biancha moglie dello re Yaymo da Ragona.

La 3<sup>a</sup> fo madama Aberona figliola de donpo Friderico lo quale era dicto re de Sicilia.

La quarta fo madama Maria moglie dello re de Maiorica.

---

<sup>2</sup> This "chapter" does not begin with a larger initial, but the previous chapter ended, at the end of the last line of column a on this folio (22<sup>v</sup>), with a colon and flourish, usual sign of a chapter end. Chapter 69V occupies all of the second column of 22<sup>v</sup>, ending mid-sentence at the end of the last line.

La V<sup>a</sup> et ultima fo madama Beatrice moglie del marchese de Monferrato et poy fo moglie del conte de Monte Campo.

Et tucti quisti infrascripti figlioli et figliole foro nati della regina Maria figliola del re de Hungaria. Lo quale re Karlo fo multo katholico et amato multo dalli suoy subditi per la sua grande clementia.

Questo dede la contessa de Nola per moglie a misser Romano Ursino de

## appendix iii

### CHAPTER TITLES ADDED BY OTHER MANUSCRIPT WITNESSES

As noted in the preface to the edition, where the base manuscript (M) has no chapter title but other manuscript witnesses do, I have omitted the added titles from the *apparatus criticus* due to their sometimes extensive length. They are found in manuscripts N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, and P<sub>3</sub>, and are given below. Because the chapter titles in manuscript SN<sub>1</sub> appear to me to have been added by a different hand, they are not included. Nor are the chapter titles of the Group B text from chapter 60 (62B) forward given below, because they appear in parallel column in the edition itself or, for chapters borrowed from Villani, in Appendix I.

2. Come li signuri et populi dela citta de Euboia edificorno la citta di Cume SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>
4. Como et perche fo disabitata la cita de Cume N<sub>1</sub>, Come li cumani per consiglio de Apollo abandonarò la citta de Cume SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>
5. Como piglao lo nomo la cita Perthenope N<sub>1</sub>, Come quilli se partero da Cume et edificaro la citta Partenope et tale nome pigliò da una donna SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>
6. Como Thiberio Iulio Tarso andò et edificò altra cita N<sub>1</sub>, Como Tiberio si parti da Parthenope et andò ad edificare nova citta SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>
7. La citta che edificò Tiberio Iulio Tarso fo chiamata in greco Napoli SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>
10. Como nacque certa differencia fra li napulitani et quilli de Nola N<sub>1</sub>, Como fo certa differentia fra napolitani et quelli de Nola SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>
11. Como Aniballo fo alo assedio de la cita de Napoli N<sub>1</sub>, Come Aniballo africano venne ad assediare Napole SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>
12. Como li napulitani mandaro ad presentare ali romani XL tasse de oro N<sub>1</sub>, Como napolitani mandaro a presentare a romani SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>
13. Le cose fece fare Tiberio nela citta de Napole SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>



14. Como Albino, Don Piero et Avorio edificaro in la citta de Napole tre fortezze *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

15. Li seggi et porte foro fatte per li detti Albino, Avorio et Don Piero *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

19 (20B). Como Virgilio fece uno cavallo de metallo per arte de nigromancia lo quale guarìo tucti li cavalli che se appressemavano *N<sub>1</sub>*, Como Vergilio ordinò uno cavallo de metallo sotto costellazioni di stelle per arte magica lo quale guaria tutti li cavalli infirmi che se accostavano ad esso *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

20 (21B). Como Virgilio fece forgiare una cecale socta costillacione delle stelle *N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

21(22B). Como Virgilio fe providimento che potesse tenere la carne ad Napoli fresca et salata *N<sub>1</sub>*, Come Virgilio fece providimento che se potesse tenere la carne fresca et salata che non se guastasse *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

22 (23B). Como Virgilio fece providimento ala conservacione de li fructi et fiuri fruttiferi che lo vento non lle guastaxe *N<sub>1</sub>*, Come Virgilio fece providimento alla conservacione delli fructi et fiuri fruttiferi che lo vento ne altro li guastasse *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

23 (24B). Como Virgilio ordinò uno loco che sinci trovassero omne raione de erbe *N<sub>1</sub>*, Como Virgilio ordinò uno loco dove se trovassero de tutte l'erbe che sono necessarie per sanita delle genti necessarie per sciruppi et altre cose *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

24 (25B). Como Virgilio fece ordinare uno loco in mare dove li napolitani havessero de omne tempo pesce frisco *N<sub>1</sub>*, Como Virgilio fece intagliare uno pesce et fattolo fabricare in mare accio che li napolitani havessero d'ogni tiempo pesce frisco *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

25 (26B). Como Virgilio fece intagliare doe ymagine luno de homo allegro et l'altra de dompna che plangea lle quale stavano ala Porta Nolana *N<sub>1</sub>*, Como Virgilio fece mirabilmente intagliare due ymagine una de homo allegro et l'altra de una donna malanconosa et fecele mettere nella intrata dela Porta Nolana et per che occasione le fece *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

26 (27B). Como Virgilio ordinò lo ioco de Carbonara per exercitare li napolitani che fossero valenti *N<sub>1</sub>*, Come Virgilio ordinò lo ioco de Carbonara per exercitare li homini che fossero valenti *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

27 (28B). Como Virgilio ordinò che dentro la cita de Napoli non s'enze trovasse niuno verme nocive che fosse venenoso *N1*, Como Virgilio fece che dentro dela citta de Napole non s'enze trovasse niuno verme nocivo de venino *SN2, P3*

28 (29B). Como Virgilio ordinò li bagni per utilita de napolitani et como li medici de Salno ne guastaro lle ymagine che insingnavano per per [*sic*] scriptura li remedii secundo la infirmitate *N1*, Como Virgilio ordinò li bagni per utilita delli napolitani et come li medici de Salerno ne guastaro le imagine che lo ditto Virgilio ce havea fatte intagliare le quale imagine mostravano per scrittura li remedii dele infirmita *SN2, P3*

29 (30B). Como Virgilio fece fare et perforare quillo monte che se va da Napoli ad Pizulo *N1*, Como Virgilio fece fare per arte la cava del monte che se va da Napole a Pezzuolo et ali bagni *SN2, P3*

30 (31B). Como Virgilio consacrò uno hovo lo quale fece mettere dentro una carraba et fecelo conservare nelo castello dell'Ovo et che lo dicto castello dovesse tanto durare quanto dura lo ovo *N1*, Como Virgilio consacrò uno ovo lo quale fe mettere dentro una carrafa et fecelo ponere dentro Castello dell'Ovo che lo ditto castello deveve tanto durare quanto se conservava lo ditto ovo *SN2, P3*

31 (32B). Como perche Virgilio sapea operare et fare tante mirabili cose *N1, SN2, P3*

32 (33B). Como poi la morte de Virgilio uno medico de re Rogeri se impetiò l'ossa de lo dicto Virgilio per la quale se credea sapere l'arte de lo dicto Virgilio *N1*, Como poi la morte di Virgilio uno medico de lo re Roggiero se impetrò dal ditto re le ossa di Virgilio *SN2, P3*

42 (43B). Como lo inperatore Costantino fece edificare ad Napoli la cappella chiamato Sancto Ianni de la Fonte *N1*, Come lo imperatore preditto fece edificare a Napole una cappella chiamata Santo Giovanni a Fonte *SN2, P3*

48 (50B). Como Patricia nepote de Constantino havendo fortuna in mare fe vuto a Dio si scampava de rechiudersi monica *N1*, Come Patritia nepote de Constantino havendo fortuna in mare si fece voto si scampava di rinchiudersi moneca dove poco apprexo moriò *SN2, P3*

49 (51B). Como lo imperator Iusticiano mandò lo Belisario ad cazare via li goti de Napuli et poi lo dicto Belisario quasi disfece la cita de Napoli *N1*,

Como lo imperatore mandò Belisario ad cacciare via li goti da Napole et como lo ditto Belisario uccise et disfece quasi tutta la citta *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

50 (52B). Como li saracini da parte de Africa vennero grande gente nelle marine de Napoli et fecero grandissimo danne ala cita et ala provincia de intorno *N<sub>1</sub>*, Come li sarracini de parte de Africa vennero con grandissima gente et smontaro alle marine de Napole dove guastaro gran parte del paese dintorno et quasi pigliaro per forza Napole dove dopoi foro succursi dale genti de Carlo Magno dove li sarraceni ala fine foro sconfitti et morti et gran gente ce morsero de christiani *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

51 (53B). Como li napolitani per la victoria che Alberico in dì de sancto Paulo ad laude de lo dicto apostolo fecero edificare la soa ecclesia *N<sub>1</sub>*, Come li napolitani per la vittoria che hebbero in dì de santo Paulo a laude delo preditto apostolo fecero edificare la sua ecclesia *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

52 (54B). Como santo Acthenasio concesse alle monache che stavano dove è mo lo Castello Novo la ecclesia de Sancta Lucia Vergene *N<sub>1</sub>*, Come santo Atanasio concesse alle monache che stavano dove è mo lo Castello Novo la ecclesia de Santa Lucia vergine che sta dentro la ecclesia de San Giovanni *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

53 (55B). Como li saracini volessero assagliare la cita de Napoli co loro armata; per accasone de una nave che se annegò si turbo la bactaglia *N<sub>1</sub>*, Essendo li sarracini accampati a Napole et havendo armati per mare una matina per tempo accostandosi con lle navi alle mura per scalarla dove una nave se annegò et cossi l'altri se turbaro et non lli dederò piu battaglia *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

54 (56B). La oracione che fece papa Gregorio azoche li saracini si annegassero *N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

58 (60B). Como lo dicto Roberto Viscardo fo captolico homo et edificò multe ecclesie *N<sub>1</sub>, SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

59 (61B). Como Roberto Viscardo passò in Romania et fece gran conquisto et poi venne alo succurso de papa Gregorio ad Roma *N<sub>1</sub>*, Como lo ditto Roberto Viscardo fece grande apparicchio per passare in Romania dove fe grande acquisto poi venne al succurso del papa a Roma et soccorselo et poco appresso moriò de poi *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

60 (62B). Como poy la morte de Roberto Viscardo succese ala signoria Rogeri secundogenito *N<sub>1</sub>*, Morto Roberto Viscardo succese alla signoria Rogieri secundogenito *SN<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>*

61A. Delle virtu de lo re Rogeri et delle soi forze *N1*, De la virtu delo ditto re Roggiero et de sue factezze *SN2, P3*

62A. Como poi la morte de lo re Rogeri soccese ala signoria lo re Guillermo lo quale fo inpresonato dalli soi baruni et vassalli *N1*, Morto lo re Roggiero soccese alla signoria llo re Guglielmo suo figliolo lo quale fo poco amato dali suoi vaxalli dove fu inpregionato dalli suoi baruni et fatto signore lo figliolo et poi lo figliolo moriò ad uno assalto d'una balestra che li dè nell'occhio de che poi per mitigare lo dolore del patre fo cacciato da prigione et remisso in signoria dove poi multi che colpa ne hebbero neli dette punitione *SN2, P3*

63A. Como poi la morte de lo re Guglermo succese ala signoria lo figliolo chiamato lo buono re Guillermo loquale perdonò ad tucti quilli che haveano facto contra alo patre *N1*, De poi la morte delo re Goglielmo preditto succese allo dominio lo re Guglielmo suo figliolo lo quale fo bene amato dali vaxalli et baruni et a tutti perdonò l'offesa fatta al suo patre et reintegrolli delle lloro terre *SN2, P3*

64A. Como lo imperatore Frederico fo tiranno signore et multo crudele *N1, SN2, P3*

65A. Como lo predicto imperatore fo scomunicato et disposto de lo imperio da papa Innocencio quarto *N1, SN2, P3*

66A. Como poi la morte de re Corrado figlolo de Frederico succese ala signoria re Manfreda *N1*, Como poi la morte de Corrado re figliolo de Federico succese alla signoria Manfreda suo figliolo bastardo *SN2, P3*

67A. Como per la concessione che fo facta de la rame de Cicilia ad re Carlo primo venne sopra re Manfreda et sconfisselo et abe lo regno in soa signoria *N1*, Come per la concessione che fo fatta a re Carlo primo per papa Clemente venne et sconfixe Manfreda et hebbe la signoria delo regno *SN2, P3*

68A. Como Corradino figlolo de re Corrado venne contra re Carlo per tollere lo regnio da lo quale re Carlo fo sconficto et prisò *N1*, Come Corradino figliolo delo re Corrado venne per tollere lo regno a re Carlo primo dove fo sconfitto et preso esso et soa gente *SN2, P3*

69A. Delle prodizi et valenticie delo re Carlo primo lo quale fo valentissimo de soa persona et de sapere *N1*, Dele prodezze et valentitie de lo re Carlo primo lo quale fo valentissimo re de persona et de sapere *SN2, P3*

70A. La rebellione de Cicilia et chi là rebellò *N1, SN2, P3*

71A. Como alo re Carlo primo soccese poi la soa morte Carlo secundo *N1, Come a re Carlo primo succese poi lo re Carlo secundo SN2, P3*

72A. Qui nomma li figlioli et figlole ch'ebbe lo dicto Carlo *N1, Li nomi deli figlioli et figliole che hebbe lo ditto re Carlo SN2, P3*

73A. Delle virtu et bonta de lo re Carlo secundo *N1, Le virtu et bonta delo ditto re Carlo secundo SN2, P3*

74A. Alo quale re Carlo secundo succese re Roberto *N1, SN2, P3*

75. Delle virtu et prodizi de lo re Roberto et como honorò li soi servituri et vassalli *N1, Dele virtu et prodezze de re Roberto et li homini che fece alli suoi servituri et vaxalli SN2, P3*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abulafia, David. *The Western Mediterranean Kingdoms, 1200–1500. The Struggle for Dominion*. London and New York, 1997.
- Altamura, Antonio, ed. *La Cronaca di Partenope*. Naples, 1974.
- Ambrasi, Domenico. “Il cristianesimo e la Chiesa napoletana dei primi secoli.” In *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 1. Naples, 1969.
- . “La vita religiosa.” In *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 3. Naples, 1969.
- Ammirato, Scipione. *Delle famiglie nobili napoletane*. 2 vols. Florence, 1580.
- Anderson, David. “‘Dominus Ludovicus’ in the Sermons of Jacobus of Viterbo (Arch. S. Pietro D. 213).” In *Literature and Religion in the Later Middle Ages*, edited by R. Newhauser and J. Alford. Binghamton, NY, 1995.
- Annechino, Raimondo. *La leggenda virgiliana nei campi flegrei*. Naples, 1937.
- Barone, N. *La ‘Ratio Thesauriorum’ della cancelleria angioina*. Naples, 1885.
- Bertaux, Émile. “Les saints Louis dans l’art italien.” *Revue des deux mondes* 158 (1900): 610–664.
- Boccaccio, Giovanni. *Decameron*. Translated by Mark Musa and Peter Bondanella. London and New York, 1982.
- Bologna, Ferdinando. *I pittori alla corte angioina di Napoli, 1266–1414*. Rome, 1969.
- Borelli, Carlo. *Repertorium universale familiarum et terrarum existentium in registris realis*. Unpublished manuscript of 1706, found in the Archivio di Stato di Napoli, microfilm “Ricostruzione angioina,” bobina 20, vol. 22.
- Briquet, Charles-Moise. *Les filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu’en 1600*. 4 vols. Paris and Geneva, 1907; reprinted with supplementary material, Amsterdam, 1968.
- Bruzelius, Caroline. *The Stones of Naples. Church Building in Angevin Italy, 1266–1343*. New Haven, 2004.
- Bühler, Curt. “The Thirteenth Recorded Manuscript of the *Cronaca di Partenope*.” *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 67 (1952): 580–584.
- Cachey, Theodore, trans. *Petrarch’s Guide to the Holy Land. Fascimile edition of Cremona, Biblioteca statale, Deposito libreria civica, manuscript BB.1.2.5, with an introductory essay, translation, and notes by Theodore J. Cachey, Jr.* Notre Dame, IN, 2002.
- Camera, Matteo. *Annali delle due Sicilie*. 2 vols. Naples, 1860.
- Capasso, Bartolomeo. “Le ‘Cronache de li antiqui Ri del Regno di Napoli’ di D. Gaspare Fuscolillo.” *ASPN* 1 (1876): 35–81, 533–564, 625–648.
- . “Le fonti della storia delle province napoletane dal 568 al 1500.” *ASPN* 1 (1876): 1–32, 181–210, 379–393, 581–618; *ASPN* 2 (1877): 3–48. Also published separately (Naples, 1902; repr. Bologna, s.d.)
- . *Historia diplomatica regni Siciliae inde ab anno 1250 ad annum 1266*. Naples, 1874.
- . *Napoli greco-romana*. Naples, 1905; reprinted 1978.

- . *Topografia della città di Napoli nel secolo XI*. Naples, 1895; reprinted 1984.
- Capasso, R. "Caracciolo, Bartolomeo." *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*. Vol. 19. Rome, 1976.
- Capitani, Ovidio. "Motivi e momenti di storiografia medioevale italiana: secc. V–XIV." In *Nuove questioni di storia medioevale*. Milan, 1979.
- Cappelli, Antonio. "Giovanni da Procida e il vespro siciliano." In *Miscellanea di opuscoli inediti o rari dei secoli XIV e XV*, vol. 1. Turin, 1861.
- Casella, M.T. "Nuovi appunti attorno a Boccaccio traduttore di Livio." *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 4 (1961): 77–129.
- . "Il volgarizzamento di Valerio Massimo dal Lancia al Boccaccio." *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 6 (1963): 49–136.
- Cilento, Nicola. "La Chiesa di Napoli dell'alto medioevo." In *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 2. Naples, 1969.
- Coluccia, Rosario. *Ferraiolo Cronaca*. Florence, 1987.
- Comparetti, Domenico. *Virgilio nel medio evo*. Florence, 1896; reprinted with an introduction by Giorgio Pasquale 1941. Published in English as *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, translated by E.F.M. Benecke with a new introduction by Jan Ziolkowski (Princeton, 1997).
- Coulter, Cornelia. "The Library of the Angevin Kings of Naples." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 75 (1944): 141–155.
- D'Agostino, Guido. "Napoli capitale (1266–1860)." In *Storia del Mezzogiorno*, vol. 5. Rome, 1986.
- D'Avray, David. *The Preaching of the Friars. Manuscript Sermons Diffused around Paris Before 1300*. Oxford, 1985.
- De Blasiis, Giuseppe. "Le case dei principi angioini nella piazza di Castelnuovo." *ASP* 11 (1886): 442–481; *ASP* 12 (1887): 289–425.
- . "Un castello svevo-angioino nel Gualdo di Napoli." *ASP* n.s. 1 (1915): 101–179.
- . "Napoli nella prima metà del secolo XIV." *ASP* n.s. 1 (1915): 253–264.
- De Blasiis, Giuseppe, ed. *Cronicon Siculum incerti authoris de rebus siculis ab anno 340 ad anum 1396*. Naples, 1887.
- De Frede, Carlo. "Caracciolo, Bartolomeo, detto Carafa." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, vol. 19. Rome, 1976.
- . "Da Carlo I d'Angiò a Giovanna I." In *Storia di Napoli*, volume 3. Naples, 1969.
- De Lellis, Carlo. *Discorsi delle famiglie nobili del Regno di Napoli*. 2 vols. Naples, 1654.
- De Marinis, Tammaro. *La biblioteca napoletana dei re d'Aragona*. 4 vols. Milan, 1947.
- "De S. Aspren vel Aspreno episcopo et confessore Neapoli in Campania commentarius historico-criticus." In *Acta Sanctorum. Augusti*, volume 1. Antwerp, 1733; reprinted Brussels, 1970.
- D'Engenio Caracciolo, Cesare. *Napoli sacra*. Naples, 1623.
- Di Giovanni, V. "Di un altro codice della Cronaca di Napoli di Giovanni Villani." *Propugnatore* 9 (1876): 174–187.
- Di Falco, Benedetto. *Descrittione de luoghi antiqui di Napoli e del suo amenissimo distretto*. Edited by Ottavio Morisani. Naples, 1972.

- Divenuto, Francesco, ed. *Napoli sacra del XVI secolo. Repertorio ... nella Cronaca del Gesuita G.F. Araldo*. Naples, 1990.
- Drijvers, Jan Willem. *Helena Augusta. The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of her Finding of the True Cross*. Leiden, 1992.
- Duchesne, L. ed. *Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire*, vol. 1. Paris, 1981.
- Facchiano, Annamaria. *Monasteri femminili e nobiltà a Napoli tra medioevo ed età moderna. Il necrologio di S. Patrizia (secc. XII–XVI)*. Altavilla Silentina, 1992.
- Fasoli, Gina. "Città e ceti urbani nell'età dei due Guglielmi." In *Potere, società e popolo nell'età dei due Guglielmi*. Bari, 1981.
- Florus, Lucius Anneus. *Epitomae de Tito Livio bellorum omnium annorum DCC libri II*. Translated by Edward Seymour Forster. New York, 1929; reprinted 1995.
- Franch, José Alcina. *La biblioteca de Alfonso V de Aragón en Nápoles. Fondos valencianos*. 2 vols. Valencia, 2000.
- Gervase of Tilbury. *Otia Imperialia. Recreation for an Emperor*. Edited and translated by S.E. Banks and J.W. Binns. Oxford, 2002.
- Glorieux, P. "Caracciolo, Francesco." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, vol. 19. Rome, 1986.
- Gundersheimer, Werner L. *Ferrara: The Style of a Renaissance Despotism*. Princeton, 1973.
- Hauri, Jacobus, ed. *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1962.
- Higden, Ranulph. *Polychronicon*. 9 vols. Edited by Joseph Rawson Lumby. London, 1865–1886; reprinted 1964.
- Isidore of Seville. *Isidori Hispaliensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*. Edited by W.M. Lindsay. 2 vols. Oxford, 1911; reprinted 1957.
- Jansen, Katherine. *The Making of the Magdalen. Preaching and Popular Devotion in the Later Middle Ages*. Princeton, 2000.
- John of Paris. *De regia potestate et papali*. Edited by Fritz Bleienstein with German translation under the title *Über königliche und päpstliche Gewalt*. Stuttgart, 1969.
- Kamp, N. "Caracciolo, Bernardo." In *DBI*, vol. 19. Rome, 1976.
- Kelly, Samantha. *The New Solomon. Robert of Naples (1309–1343) and Fourteenth-Century Kingship*. Leiden, 2003.
- . "Robert of Naples (1309–1343) and the Spiritual Franciscans." *Cristianesimo nella storia* 20 (1999): 41–80.
- Kreutz, Barbara. *Before the Normans. Southern Italy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*. Philadelphia, 1991.
- Léonard, Émile. *Les Angevins de Naples*. Paris, 1954.
- Leone presbytero. "Vita altera S. Patriciae virginis auctore Leone presbytero." In *Acta Sanctorum. Augusti*, volume 5. Antwerp, 1741; reprinted Brussels, 1970.
- Lerner, Robert E. "Poverty, Preaching, and Eschatology in the Revelation Commentaries of 'Hugh of St. Cher.'" In *The Bible in the Medieval World. Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, edited by Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood. Oxford, 1985.



- Livy (Titus Livius). *Ab urbe condita*. Volume 4 (Books VIII–X). Translated by B.O. Foster. Cambridge, MA, 1926; reprinted 1982.
- . *Ab urbe condita*. Volume 5 (Books XXI–XXII). Translated by B.O. Foster. Cambridge, MA, 1982.
- . *Ab urbe condita*. Volume 6 (Books, XXIII–XXV). Translated by Frank Gardner Moore. Cambridge, MA, 1984.
- Lo Monaco, Francesco, ed. *Itinerario in Terra Santa*. Bergamo, 1990.
- Lo Parco, Francesco. *Niccolò da Reggio grecista italiota del secolo XIV e l'interpretazione dell'epigrafe greca del tempio dei Dioscuri di Napoli ricordata dalla 'Cronaca di Partenope'*. Naples, 1909.
- Marsand, Antonio. *I manoscritti italiani della regia biblioteca parigina*. 2 vols. Paris, 1835–1838.
- Mauro, Alfredo. *Francesco del Toppo e il suo 'Esopo'*. Città del Castello, 1926.
- Mazzatinti, Giuseppe. *La biblioteca dei re d'Aragona in Napoli*. Rocca S. Casciano, 1897.
- . *Inventario dei manoscritti italiani delle biblioteche di Francia*. 3 vols. Rome, 1886–1888.
- Meisen, Karl. *Nikolauskult und Nikolausbrauch im Abendlande. Eine kultgeographisch-volkskundliche Untersuchung*. Düsseldorf, 1931; reprinted Mainz, 1981.
- Miglio, L. "Caracciolo, Enrico." In *DBI*, vol. 19. Rome, 1976.
- Minieri-Riccio, Camillo. "Genealogia di Carlo II d'Angiò re di Napoli." *ASPN* 7 (1882): 15–67, 201–262, 465–496, 653–684; *ASPN* 8 (1883): 5–33, 197–226, 381–396, 587–600.
- Mombritius, Boninus. *Sanctuarium seu Vitae Sanctorum*. 2 vols. Paris, 1910.
- Monti, Gennaro Maria. "Il cosiddetto 'Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio' fonte della 'Cronaca di Partenope.'" In idem, *Dai normanni agli aragonesi. Terza serie di studi storico-giuridici*. Trani, 1936.
- . "La 'Cronaca di Partenope' (Premessa all'edizione critica)." In idem, *Dai normanni agli aragonesi. Terza serie di studi storico-giuridici*. Trani, 1936. [Originally published in *Annali del Seminario Giuridico Economico della R. Università di Bari* 5 (1932)]
- . "L'età angioina." In *Storia della università di Napoli*. Naples, 1924; reprinted 1993.
- . "Il Patto dotale napoletano di Capuana e Nido." In *Dal Duecento al Settecento. Studi storico-giuridici*. Naples, 1925.
- . "Una nuova fonte di storia angioina: un'altra cronaca martiniana in volgare." *ASPN* n.s. 28 (1942): 75–98.
- Napoli, Mario. "La città." In *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 2, part 2. Naples, 1969.
- Neckam, Alexander. *Alexandri Neckam De naturis rerum*. Edited by Thomas Wright. London, 1863.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Trans. Frank Justus Miller. Cambridge, MA, 1977.
- Palma, M. "Caracciolo, Landulfo." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, vol. 19. Rome, 1986.
- Panella, E., ed. *Per lo studio di fra Remigio dei Girolami (d. 1319). Contra falsos Ecclesie professores cc. 5–37*. Pistoia, 1979.
- Paoletta, Alfonso, ed. *Volgarizzamento meridionale anonimo di Francesco Pet-*

- arca, *Itinerarium breve de Ianua usque ad Ierusalem et Terram Sanctam*. Bologna, 1993.
- Papias. *Vocabulista*. Edited by Boninus Mombritius. Venice, 1496; reprinted Turin, 1966.
- Percopo, Erasmo. "I Bagni di Pozzuoli. Poemetto napoletano del secolo XIV." *ASPN* 11 (1886): 597-750.
- Perrault, Guillaume (Guilielmus Peraldus). *Summa de vitiis*. Basel, s.d. (1500-1599); first published Venice, 1497.
- Perrone, Carla. "Una probabile fonte della 'Cronaca di Partenope.'" *Annali della Facoltà di Magisterio dell'Università di Lecce* 1 (1970-1971): 151-162.
- Pertusi, Agostino. "Ai confini tra religione e politica. La contesa per le reliquie di S. Nicola tra Bari, Venezia e Genova." *Quaderni medievali* 5 (1978): 6-56.
- Petrarch (Francesco Petrarca). *Le familiari*. Facing-page Latin-Italian edition of *Rerum familiarum libri*. 2 vols. Rome, 1991.
- Petrucci, Livio. "Le fonti per la conoscenza della topografia delle terme Flegree dal XII al XV secolo." *ASPN* 97 (1979): 99-129.
- . "Lasciti della prima circolazione della 'Genealogia deorum gentilium' in un manoscritto campano del Quattrocento." *Studi mediolatini e volgari* 27 (1980-1981): 163-181.
- Pispisa, Enrico. "L'immagine della città nella storiografia meridionale del Duecento." *Quaderni medievali* 30 (1990): 63-108.
- Pollastri, Sylvie. "Les Bursons d'Anjou, barons de Nocera puis comtes de Satriano (1268-1400)." In *La noblesse dans les territoires angevins à la fin du moyen âge*, edited by Noël Coulet and Jean-Michel Matz. Rome, 2000.
- Procopius of Caesaria. *History of the Wars*. Translated by H.B. Dewing. Cambridge, MA, 1919; reprinted 1993.
- Romano, Serena. "Introduzione: la cattedrale di Napoli, i vescovi e l'immagine. Una storia di lunga durata." In *Il Duomo di Napoli dal paleocristiano all'età angioina*, edited by Serena Romano and Nicholas Bock. Naples, 2002.
- Romuald of Salerno. *Romualdi salernitani chronicon*. In *RIS*, vol. 7, part 1. Edited by Ludovico Muratori (Milan, 1723-1738), and reprinted with updated editorial apparatus by Carlo Alberto Garufi. Citta del Castello, 1914-1935.
- Runciman, Steven. *The Sicilian Vespers. A History of the Mediterranean World in the Later Thirteenth Century*. Cambridge, Eng., 1958.
- Sabatini, Francesco. *Napoli angioina. Cultura e società*. Naples, 1975.
- . "Le origini della letteratura volgare napoletana: Dal rifiuto dei siciliani all'imitazione dei modelli centrali." In *Omaggio a Camillo Guerrieri-Crocetti*. Genoa, 1971.
- Santamaria, Pasquale. *Historia collegii patrum canonicarum metropolitanae ecclesiae neapolitanae*. Naples, 1900.
- Schipa, Michelangelo. "Contese sociali a Napoli nel medio evo." *ASPN* 31 (1906): 395-427, 575-622; *ASPN* 32 (1907): 68-123, 314-377, 513-586, 757-797; *ASPN* 33 (1908): 81-127.
- . "Nobili e popolani in Napoli nel medioevo in rapporto all'amministrazione municipale." *Archivio storico italiano* ser. 7, 3 (1925): 3-44, 187-248.
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Naturales Quaestiones*. Translated by Thomas H. Corcoran. Cambridge, MA, 1972.

- . *Select Letters of Seneca*. Edited and with introduction by Walter C. Summers. London, 1910.
- Sicola, Sigismundo. *Primus elenchus nonnullarum illustrium familiarum ... ex regali archivio Magne Regie Curie*. Unpublished manuscript of 1686, found in the Archivio di Stato di Napoli, microfilm "Ricostruzione angioina," bobina 15, vol. 12.
- Soria, Francescantonio. *Memorie storico-critiche degli storici napoletani*. 2 vols. Naples, 1782.
- Spargo, John Webster. *Virgil the Necromancer*. Cambridge, MA, 1934.
- Spiegel, Gabrielle. *Romancing the Past. The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1993.
- Summonte, Giovanni Antonio. *Historia della città e regno di Napoli*. Naples, 1675; first published in 1601.
- Thurston, Herbert, and Donald Attwater, eds. *Butler's Lives of the Saints: Complete Edition*. 4 vols. New York, 1963.
- Torraca, Francesco. "Giovanni Boccaccio a Napoli (1326–1339)." *ASPN* 39 (1914): 25–80, 229–267, 409–458, 605–696.
- Touhy, Thomas. *Herculean Ferrara. Ercole d'Este (1471–1505) and the Invention of a Ducal Capital*. Cambridge, Eng., 1996.
- Trifone, Romualdo. *La legislazione angioina*. Naples, 1921.
- Valerius Maximus. *Facta et dicta memorabilia*. Edited by John Briscoe. 2 vols. Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1998.
- Venditti, Arnaldo. "L'architettura del Alto Medioevo." In *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 2, part 2. Naples, 1969.
- . "Urbanistica e architettura angioina." In *Storia di Napoli*, vol. 3. Naples, 1969.
- Vetere, Carla. *Le Consuetudini di Napoli. Il testo e la tradizione*. Naples, 1999.
- Villani, Giovanni. *Nuova Cronica*. Edited by Giuseppe Porta. Parma, 1990–1991.
- Virgil. *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I–VI*. Translated by H. Rushton Fairclough. Cambridge, MA, 1916; reprinted 1994.
- "Vita altera S. Patriciae virginis auctore Leone presbytero." In *Acta Sanctorum Augusti*, vol. 5. Antwerp, 1741; reprinted Brussels, 1970.
- Vitale, Giuliana. *Élite burocratica e famiglia. Dinamiche nobiliari e processi di costruzione statale nella Napoli angioina-aragonese*. Naples, 2003.
- Vitolo, Giovanni. *Città e coscienza civica nel Mezzogiorno medievale (secc. IX–XIII)*. Salerno, 1990.
- . "Il regno angioino." In *Storia del Mezzogiorno*, vol. 4. Rome, 1986.
- . *Tra Napoli e Salerno. La costruzione dell'identità cittadina nel Mezzogiorno medievale*. Salerno, 2001.
- Vitolo, Giovanni, and Rosalba di Meglio. *Napoli angioino-aragonese. Confraternite ospedali dinamiche politico-sociali*. Salerno, 2003.
- Voci, Anna Maria. "La cappella di corte dei primi sovrani angioini di Napoli." *ASPN* 113 (1995): 69–126.
- Vuolo, Antonio. *Una testimonianza agiografica napoletana. Il 'Libellus miraculorum S. Agnelli' (sec. X)*. Naples, 1987.
- Waitz, Georg, ed. *Ex miraculis sancti Agrippini*. In *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et italicarum saec. VI–IX*. Hannover, 1878.

- . *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum*. In *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et italarum saec. VI–IX*. Hannover, 1878.
- . *Liber de apparitione sancti Michaelis in Monte Gargano*. In *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et italarum saec. VI–IX*. Hannover, 1878.
- . *Neapolitanorum victoria ficta*. In *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et italarum saec. VI–IX*. Hannover, 1878.
- . *Vita Athanasii episcopi neapolitani*. In *MGH. Scriptores rerum langobardorum et italarum saec. VI–IX*. Hannover, 1878.
- Watt, J.A. trans. *John of Paris. On Royal and Papal Power*. Toronto, 1971.
- Whatley, E. Gordon. “Constantine the Great, the Empress Helena, and the Relics of the True Cross.” In *Medieval Hagiography*, edited by Thomas Head. New York and London, 2001.
- Wickham, Chris. “The Sense of the Past in Italian Communal Narratives.” In *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, edited by Paul Magdalino. London, 1992.



## INDEX

Italicized page numbers refer to the text of the edition or of other manuscripts in Appendices II and III. For medieval persons with cognomens including “di,” “de” or “da” that are not clearly surnames, the name is listed twice (“Eustazio da Matera” and “da Matera, Eustazio”); similar names for early-modern and modern persons are understood to be surnames and so listed (“de Blasiis, Giuseppe”).

- “Abbate di Napoli” 3n, 52  
 Acciaiuoli, Niccolò 26  
 Acutius, saint 221–223, 306–307  
 Adam de Dussiac 45n  
 Aenaria 58, 165–166, 173, 285, 289  
 Agrippinus, saint 46, 47, 71, 241–242, 312. See also *Ex miraculis sancti Agrippini*  
 Alexander the Great 174, 291  
 Alexander III, pope 128  
 Alfonso I, king of Naples 99  
 Alfonso X, king of Castile 265, 324  
 Alfonso, duke of Calabria 97n, 114  
 Altamura, Antonio 6, 12n, 106n, 110n, 120n, 122, 123n  
 Andrew of Hungary 14, 23–25, 86–87, 94, 132, 275, 277, 280–281, 329. See also Joanna I, marriages  
 Anecletus, antipope 248, 316  
 Annecchino, Raimondo 304  
 Anthino, duke of Naples 73, 77, 238–239, 311  
 Apollo 59, 167, 169, 171, 180–181, 286, 289, 341  
 “Aquarie” families of Naples 46, 178–179  
 Araldo, Giovanni Francesco 46n  
 Ara Petri (Naples): see S. Pietro ad Ara  
 Archivio di Stato (Naples) 117–118  
 Aristotle 121, 148  
 Aspren, saint, bishop of Naples 68, 109, 201–202, 206–212, 218–220, 303  
 Astrino, Leonardo 125  
 Athanasius, saint, bishop of Naples 71, 77n, 155, 239–240, 311, 313, 344. See also *Vita Athanasii*  
 Augustine, saint 73, 237, 285, 310  
 Ayglerius, archbishop of Naples 36  
 Bancroft Library (Berkeley) 125n  
 Barbato da Sulmona 51  
 Barrile, Giovanni 51  
 Bartolomeo da Besanto 23  
 Bartolomeo da Capua 23, 34n, 45, 45n  
 Baths of Pozzuoli viii, 4, 51, 108, 125, 194–195, 299–300. See also Peter of Eboli, “Trattato dei bagni”  
 Beinecke Library (New Haven) 125n  
 Belisarius 73–74, 231–232, 309, 343–344  
 Benedict XII, pope 111  
 Benevento 93, 94, 172–174, 179–180, 183, 244, 246–247, 290, 312, 315  
 battle of 261–264, 320–321, 325  
 Berardo de Turricella 96, 113  
 Bernardo, abbot of Montecassino 36  
 Biblioteca apostolica vaticana (Vatican City) 110–111  
 Biblioteca centrale della regione siciliana (Palermo) 103–104

- Biblioteca Estense (Modena) 114–115
- Biblioteca nazionale (Florence) 109–110
- Biblioteca nazionale (Naples) 111–112, 120–121, 122–123
- Bibliothèque nationale (Paris) 104–106, 111, 113, 119–120
- Boccaccio, Giovanni 28, 51, 58–59, 99, 292, 293
- Bondino, Giacomo 125
- Boniface VIII, pope 274, 328
- Brancaccio family 34–35n, 41n, 90, 91n  
 Bartolomeo 34  
 Giovanni Brancaccio-Zoso 40  
 Ligorio Brancaccio-Zoso 90
- Briquet, Charles-Moïse 105–106, 109, 114–115, 118, 119, 121
- Bruzelius, Caroline 43–44, 45n, 49n, 327
- Bühler, Carl 107n, 122. See also Morgan Library
- Caetani di Ceccano, Annibale, archbishop of Naples 36
- Calcis 58–59, 165, 167, 172–173, 285–286, 289
- Candida, saint 163, 201–202, 204–208, 218–221, 303
- Cannae, battle of 63, 176
- Capasso, Bartolomeo 5, 11–12, 15n, 16–17, 20–21, 24n, 58n, 79, 89, 92, 98, 103–104, 116, 119, 121, 123, 124n, 292, 294
- Capece, Maria 46
- Cappelli, Antonio 114–115
- Capetian dynasty 82. See also individual Capetian rulers
- Capitani, Ovidio 8n
- Capponi, Gino 109n
- Caracciolo  
 family of 21–26, 35–36, 39  
 Agnese 35n  
 Cesare d’Engenio 15n, 47n, 98n  
 Francesco 35–36  
 Giovanni 22  
 Jacopo 35n  
 Landulfo 25, 35–36  
 Marcello 35n  
 Marino 22, 35n  
 Niccolò 35n  
 Pietro 22, 35n  
 Roberto 22  
 Tirello 35n  
 Matteo Caracciolo-Carafa 45  
 Enrico Caracciolo-Rosso 25–26  
 Filippo Caracciolo-Rosso 26  
 Landulfo Caracciolo-Rosso 22  
 Caracciolo-Carafa, Bartolomeo as author of “Breve Informazioni” (a.k.a. “Part II”) only 11, 13, 16–19  
 as author of *Cronaca* 3, 12n, 14, 16–21, 115n  
 authorial style of 75–78  
 biography and career of 23–26, 49, 75, 314, 326, 328  
 comparison of *Cronaca B* progenitor to 84–87, 132  
 comparison of “Southernized Villani” author to 83  
 conservative vision of 47–49, 50, 85  
 death of 15, 27, 58  
 intellectual profile of 20, 75–78, 289, 309  
 manuscript references to 11, 115, 118n, 123, 126  
 patrician outlook of 28–31, 41, 49  
 religious orthodoxy of 69  
 transformation of Naples during lifetime of 27  
 use of vernacular of 20, 52–53
- Caracciolo-Carafa, Bartolomeo, father of *Cronaca* author 23
- Caracciolo-Carafa, Bartolomeo, son of *Cronaca* author 24–25, 35n, 308

- Carafa, Francesco 119
- Carbonara 66n, 179, 191–192, 259, 342
- Carolingian dynasty 82, 310–311, 313. See also individual Carolingian rulers
- Casella, Francesco Antonio 116
- Castel Capuana (Naples) 184–185, 252, 295
- Castel dell'Ovo (Naples) 88–89, 197–200, 228, 231, 240, 252, 301–302, 343
- Castel Nuovo (Naples) 31n, 39, 42, 44, 48, 85, 131, 268, 277–278, 325, 344
- Cazapoto, Tommaso 96, 122
- Charlemagne 157, 232–234, 310–311
- Charles I of Anjou, king of Naples 19, 27–28, 36, 38n, 42–43, 52, 57, 75, 82, 105, 107, 127–128, 131, 141, 143, 186, 261–270, 320–321, 324–326
- Charles II of Anjou, king of Naples 11, 27, 29, 33, 35n, 37n, 38n, 43–45, 47, 58, 75, 83–84, 88, 91, 270–275, 326–328  
 building projects of 32n, 43–45, 48, 83, 271, 273, 326  
 children of 15, 47, 83, 122, 127, 271–272, 327, 330–332  
 nobles enfeoffed by 75, 273–274, 327–328
- Charles V, emperor 118
- Charles VIII, king of France 97–98, 106, 113–114
- Charles IX, King of France 97
- Charles the Bald 242, 313
- Charles, duke of Calabria 23, 94, 276, 328
- Charles of Durazzo, king of Naples 87, 280–281, 329
- Charles of Valois 15, 272, 327
- Chioccarelli, Bartolomeo 20
- Chironte 133, 135n, 139, 144, 153, 198, 301
- Chronicon Amalfitanum* 4n
- Chronicon di Santa Maria del Principio (SMP)*, 4n, 6n, 22, 48–49, 67–68, 70–73, 76n, 77, 134, 135, 302–306, 313
- Cicero 121, 148
- Clement IV, pope 83, 105, 107, 136, 264, 321, 345
- Clement VI, pope 279–280, 328
- Coluccia, Rosario 122
- Collenuccio, Pandolfo 79
- “Commentary V,” 4n, 51n, 58–66, 67n, 75, 134–135, 285–290, 293–296, 299–301, 304
- Comparetti, Domenico 66, 295
- Constance, legendary daughter of Constantine 71, 98, 225–226, 308
- Constance, queen of Sicily 82, 86, 253–257
- Constantine, Roman emperor 4, 47, 70–71, 77, 91, 93–94, 98, 134, 214, 216, 218–219, 223–227, 232, 305–309  
 Donation of, 18, 68–69, 93, 224, 305
- Conrad IV Staufeu, king of Germany and Sicily 83, 131, 258–261, 263, 319–320, 337–338, 345
- Conradin Staufeu 27, 84, 263, 265–269, 320, 324, 338, 345
- Contarini, Luigi 79, 125
- Council of Nicaea 223, 307
- Crescenzo, Ligorio 38n
- Cronaca di Partenope*  
 as source for later works 4–5, 79–101  
 authorship of: see Caracciolo-Carafa, Bartolomeo  
 date of composition of 12n, 14–16, 19, 21  
 distinction between original (“A”) and redacted (“B”) versions 5, 7, 13, 15, 35n, 75n, 83–87, 91, 95, 97, 99, 125–132, 134, 135, 136, 139, 144, 147, 151, 152, 287, 296, 300, 305, 306, 313, 316–329



- Cronaca di Partenope (continued)*  
 editions of 5, 7, 12, 20–21, 80–81, 124–125, 137  
 manuscripts of 13, 18, 103–124  
 Neapolitan communal identity in 4–5, 9, 29–31, 47–50  
 previous scholarly division into “parts” of 11–13, 16–21, 80, 91, 92, 93–94, 123, 132  
 sources for 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 22, 51, 55–78  
 vernacular idiom of 3, 4, 7n, 49–50, 52–53, 78, 104
- Cronicon Siculum* 39, 72, 79, 89–94  
 “Cuomo zibaldone,” 79.
- Cumae 56–57, 59–62, 124, 139, 165–169, 173, 183, 194, 244, 285–287, 289–290, 294, 304, 341
- Cumaeans sibil 55, 59–60, 68, 167, 169, 183, 212–213, 286, 304
- Daedalus 59–60, 166–167, 286
- Dante 99, 325
- d’Agostino, Guido 4, 33n, 38n
- d’Alife, Niccolò 42, 51
- d’Avray, David 78
- d’Este, Ercole 97, 114
- d’Ormont, Hubert, archbishop of Naples 22, 35n, 36
- da Besanto, Bartolomeo 23
- da Capua, Bartolomeo 23, 34n, 45, 45n
- da Gaeta, Francesco 105
- da Matera, Eustazio 57–58, 61, 76, 134–135, 182–183, 294, 296
- da Monterone, Pietro 58n
- da Perugia, Paolo 51
- da Procida, Giovanni 132, 265, 269–270, 326
- da Reggio, Niccolò 17, 30, 65n, 171–172, 289
- da Sessa, Vincenzo 109
- da Sulmona, Barbato 51
- da Viterbo, Jacopo, archbishop of Naples 36
- Desiderius, king of Lombardy 157, 232–233, 310–311
- de Aliberto, Pietro 96, 112
- de Blasiis, Guiseppe 32n, 39n, 51n, 52n, 89n, 90, 91n, 92n, 291, 292, 311
- de Cadenuto, Pedro 42
- de Chiavellis, Tommaso 96, 113
- de Dussiac, Adam 45n
- de Falco, Antonio 125
- de Frede, Carlo 23, 24, 37n
- de Marinis, Tammaro 97n, 105
- de Montecello, Matteo 96–97, 113
- de Presenzani, Evangelista 125
- de Turricella, Berardo 96, 113
- de Valéry, Énard (Alardo il Vecchio) 265–268, 325
- de’ Cabanni, Roberto 25
- de’ Girolami, Remigio 69
- de’ Paterno, Alvaro 79
- de la Rath, Diego 45n, 278
- del Tuppo, Francesco 98–100, 105, 124
- della Vigna, Pietro 50
- di Donoratico, Gerardo 265, 267, 324, 338
- di Falco, Benedetto 5n, 125, 288
- di Giovanni, Vincenzo 122, 134
- di Meglio, Rosalba 28n, 43n, 45n, 48n
- Diego de la Rath 45n, 278
- Dominican order 24, 43, 69, 326
- Draco 165, 285
- Énard de Valéry (Alardo il Vecchio) 265–268, 325
- Euboea 58–59, 165, 167–169, 172–173, 285–286, 289
- Eustazio da Matera 57–58, 61, 76, 134–135, 182–183, 294, 296
- Eutyches, saint 221–223, 306–307
- Ex miraculis sancti Agrippini* 71, 312. See also Agrippinus, saint
- Ferdinand I, king of Aragon 117–118
- Ferraiolo, Melchiorre 122
- Flegrean Fields 4

- Florus, Lucius Anneus 64, 182–183, 293, 300  
 Francesco da Gaeta 105  
 Franch, José Alcina 115  
 Franciscan order 34n, 45, 68–69  
 Frederick I, king of Aragon 115  
 Frederick I Barbarossa, emperor 86, 254, 318  
 Frederick II Staufien, king of Sicily, emperor 37–38n, 50n, 82, 86, 91, 131, 141, 253, 255, 257–259, 294, 319  
 Frederick of Austria 267, 324  
 Fuscolillo, Gaspare 79, 92–94, 100, 123  
  
 Galante, Gennaro Aspreno 119  
 Gaudiosus, saint 73, 95, 143, 237, 310  
 Gerardo di Donoratico 265, 267, 324, 338  
 Gervase of Tilbury 66, 76, 185, 210, 295–301  
*Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum* 3, 51, 71, 77–78, 109, 311, 313  
*Gesta S. Silvestri* 70, 77n, 305, 307–308. See also Silvester, pope  
 Gimigliano, Giovanna 106n  
 Giotto 30, 31n, 85  
 Giovanni da Procida 132, 265, 269–270, 326  
 Goths 73–74, 231–232, 309  
 Gregory IV, pope 71, 135, 243, 313  
 Gregory VII, pope 246–247, 315  
 Guiscard, Robert 19, 74, 91, 93, 144n, 244–248, 256n, 314–315, 334  
  
 Hadrian I, pope 233, 310  
 Hadrian II, pope 239, 312  
 Hannibal 63–64, 176–177, 291  
 Helena, saint 71, 224–225, 227–231, 308–309  
 Henry IV, emperor 246–247, 315  
 Henry VI, emperor 81–82, 86, 253–257  
  
 Henry VII, emperor 276, 328–329  
 Henry of Castile 267, 324  
 Higden, Ranulf 69–70, 285  
 Horace 61, 182, 287  
 Hubert d’Ormont, archbishop of Naples 22, 35n, 36  
 Hugh of St. Cher 69  
  
 Innocent II, pope 315–316  
 Innocent IV, pope 84, 131, 259, 319  
  
 Jacopo da Viterbo, archbishop of Naples 36  
 Januarius, saint 46, 71, 221–223, 241, 307, 312  
 Jews, converted by Saint Silvester 224–225, 307  
 Joanna I, queen of Naples 11, 25–26, 34, 36n, 53, 88–89, 94, 125, 132, 275–281, 328  
     marriages of 14–15, 23, 86  
 John XII, pope 241–242, 312  
 John the Baptist 25, 144, 210–211, 225–226, 308  
 John of Paris 70  
 John of Salisbury 58, 62, 294–295  
 John Rylands Library, Manchester, England 98n, 124  
 Justinian, emperor 73, 231–232  
  
 Lactantius 57, 61, 173, 290  
 Ladislas, king of Naples 98n  
 “Later Angevin Chronicle,” 13 14n, 15n, 21n, 79, 87–89, 94, 99–100, 122, 123n, 124  
 Leo IV, pope 135, 242n, 313  
 Léonard, Émile 14n, 23, 26n, 320, 321, 324, 329  
*Libellus miraculorum S. Agnelli* 310  
*Liber de apparitione sancti Michaelis*, 71–72 313. See also Michael, saint  
*Liber pontificalis*, 70 77n, 305–308  
 Livy (Titus Livius) 50, 51, 57, 59, 60–64, 76, 166, 173, 174, 176, 178, 183, 285, 288–291, 293

- Lothar I, Carolingian emperor 71, 242, 313
- Louis the German, king of East Frankia 242, 313
- Louis the Great, king of Hungary: invasion of southern Italy 15n, 24, 87, 280, 329
- Louis IX, saint, king of France 143, 268
- Louis of Anjou, saint, bishop of Toulouse 46–47, 85, 271, 330
- Louis of Taranto, king of Naples 14–15, 25–26, 53, 87, 91n, 126, 132, 279–281, 328
- Lo Parco, Francesco 30, 289
- Lucy, saint 25, 71, 225–227, 257, 259. See also S. Lucia (Naples)
- Ludwig of Bavaria 276, 328
- Lutatius 57, 290. See also Lactantius
- Maiorana, Cristoforo 114
- Manfred Staufeu, king of Naples 132, 261–264, 269–270, 320–323, 325–326, 337–338, 345
- Maramauro, Guglielmo 94–95
- Maria of Hungary, queen of Naples 144n, 271–272, 330, 332
- Martin of Troppau 111, 148
- Mary Magdalen, saint 43, 45–47, 258, 319
- Matteo de Montecello 96–97, 113
- Mazza, Alessandro 96, 112
- Mazzatinti, Giuseppe 97n, 106n, 113n, 114, 120
- Mazzocchi, Alessio Simmaco 20
- Mennio, Giovan Rinaldo 114
- Michael, saint 43n, 71–72, 243, 313
- Minutolo, Filippo, archbishop of Naples 36
- Mombritius, Boninus (Bonino Mombrizio) 70
- Montecassino, abbey and surrounding region of 36, 52n, 335
- Monti, Gennaro Maria 6, 11, 12n, 14, 15n, 16–17, 20, 23–24, 31n, 40, 45, 56, 58, 68, 71–72, 79, 98n, 99n, 103–104, 105n, 106n, 108, 110n, 111, 113n, 115n, 118n, 119, 120–122, 123n, 124, 125n, 126n, 134n, 142n, 302–305, 313
- Morgan Library (New York) 98n, 106–109, 122, 124n
- Muslims: see Saracens
- Naples
- Angevin royal government in 3, 4, 27, 32–34, 38, 44, 48, 50
- Aragonese rule of 46n, 80, 96–97, 98–99, 105, 114–115
- castles of: see individual castles
- cathedral of 3, 4, 17, 20, 22, 35–36, 43–44, 48, 49n, 68, 77, 85, 86, 186, 216–223, 225, 227, 259, 261–262, 264, 296, 305–306, 321
- churches of: see individual churches
- communal identity in 4, 7, 9, 31, 44, 49
- Greek culture of in antiquity 11, 57n, 59, 60, 165–168, 171–172, 285, 289–290, 304
- Greek culture of in Middle Ages 73n, 134, 172, 216–217, 289, 305, 309
- immigration to 28–31, 74, 179–182, 231–238, 292, 309–310
- merchants of 28–29
- municipal government of 23, 31–33, 36–38, 41
- patriciate of 20, 22, 29–37, 39, 42, 45–50, 53, 85, 97
- seggi*, 20 33, 37–41, 65, 179–182, 292
- Capuana 37, 38n, 39–41, 48, 90, 140, 180, 186, 292–293, 296
- Casanova 38n
- Forcella 32n, 37, 38n, 46, 241, 312
- Melaci 38n
- Montagna 98n

- Nido 23, 24, 38n, 39–41, 48,  
 90, 91n, 181, 186–187, 292–  
 293, 296  
 Portanova 28, 41, 65, 90n,  
 181, 293  
 Porto 28, 38n, 40, 41, 65, 90n,  
 98, 178–179, 181, 292–293  
 Sant’Arcangelo (San Michele)  
 72, 180  
 San Gennaro a Diaconia 38n  
 Santo Stefano 38n  
 university of 31, 45, 48  
 vernacular literature, origins in  
 3, 52–53  
 Neckam, Alexander 57–58, 61–62,  
 67, 185, 295, 298  
 Nicholas II, pope 245, 314  
 Nicholas IV, pope 111  
 Nicholas, saint, bishop of Myra  
 223, 307  
 Niccolò d’Alife 42, 51  
 Niccolò da Reggio 17, 30, 65n,  
 171–172, 289  
 Nola 25, 57n, 60, 63–64, 145, 172–  
 175, 179–180, 184, 237, 274, 290–  
 292, 295–296, 299, 340–341  
 Normans 11, 55, 74–75, 83–84,  
 91–92, 129, 243, 245, 252, 314,  
 317, 334. See also individual  
 Norman rulers  
 Notar Giacomo 79  
 Notre Dame de Nazareth (Aix-en-  
 Provence) 270–271, 273–274,  
 326  
 Octavian, emperor 182, 184, 193,  
 223, 294  
 Odo of Cheriton 69  
 Orsini family  
 Bertaldo, archbishop of Naples  
 36  
 Giovanni Caetani, archbishop of  
 Naples 36  
 Romano, count of Nola 145,  
 274, 340  
 Ovid 57, 61, 64, 158, 166, 170, 182,  
 285, 287–288, 293  
 “Pactum Sergii,” 90  
 Palaepolis 41, 56–57, 60–63, 65n,  
 172–173, 179, 181, 288–291  
 Paolella, Alfonso 7n, 96, 106, 107n,  
 108n, 109, 110, 112n, 118n, 120–  
 121, 300  
 Paolo da Perugia 51  
 Pappacoda family 28n, 47n  
 Pappansogna, Ruggiero 98  
 Parthenope 56–57, 60–62, 65, 168–  
 173, 179, 183, 286–288, 290, 293,  
 294, 299, 341  
 Pasquale, Giorgio 66–67, 295  
 Patrizia (Patricia), saint 47, 71, 77,  
 225, 227–231, 239–240, 308–309.  
 See also S. Patrizia (Naples)  
 Paul, saint 73, 232–233, 236, 238,  
 242, 311, 344. See also S. Paolo  
 Maggiore (Naples)  
 Pedro de Cadenuto 42  
 Percopo, Erasmo 6, 16, 124n  
 Perrault, Guillaume (Guilelmus  
 Peraldus) 69  
 Perrone, Carlachiarra 12n  
 Peter, saint 3, 47, 71, 158n, 201–  
 209, 214, 242, 303, 305  
 Peter of Anjou 23  
 Peter of Aragon 269–270, 326  
 Peter of Eboli 3n, 4, 50–51, 52,  
 106–108, 124, 300. See also  
 “Trattato dei Bagni”  
 Petrarch (Francesco Petrarca) 51,  
 58n, 106–108, 109n, 110, 112,  
 117, 121, 136, 298, 300  
 Pesce, Roberto 104n, 110n  
 Petrucci, Livio 4n, 12n, 56, 58,  
 106n, 108n, 115n, 116, 121n,  
 125n, 300  
 Philip IV “the Fair,” king of France  
 15–16, 272, 327  
 Philip VI, king of France 15–16,  
 272, 327, 349  
 Philip I of Taranto 271, 272,  
 349  
 Philip II of Taranto 89n  
 Pietro da Monterone 58n  
 Pietro de Aliberto 96, 112

- Pietro della Vigna 50  
 Pispisa, Enrico 8n  
 Pitheculusae: see Aenaria  
 Pontano 96  
 Porsile, Carlo 125  
 Pozzuoli 28n, 45, 125, 195, 291,  
 300, 311, 312. See also Baths of  
 Pozzuoli, Peter of Eboli  
 Procolo, Pietro 46, 47n  
 Procopius of Caesaria 73–74, 76,  
 309
- Regimen sanitatis* 3n, 52  
 Remigio de' Girolami 69  
 Robert of Anjou, king of Naples  
 11, 17, 23, 24, 30, 33, 35n, 36n,  
 39, 40n, 44, 48, 50–53, 75, 85,  
 88n, 111n, 116, 171–172, 271,  
 275–280, 288–289, 300, 328–329,  
 346  
 Robert of Taranto 14, 89n  
 Roberto de' Cabanni 25  
 Romuald of Salerno 74–76, 129–  
 130, 314–317  
 Roger II, king of Sicily 19, 74, 82–  
 85, 118, 127, 129, 199, 247–250,  
 253, 255, 315–316, 318, 343, 345  
 Rome:  
 ancient Naples' dealings with  
 60, 63–64, 76, 172–175, 177–  
 178, 183, 184, 290–291  
 in Cumaean sibyl's prophecy  
 213  
 Constantine and 214–215, 223,  
 225  
 (Holy Roman) emperors of 233,  
 244, 257  
 Neapolitan churches compared to  
 those of 218, 227  
 Saint Peter and 202, 209, 303  
 other popes or Church of 242,  
 258, 261, 263  
 Virgilian legends and 67, 200,  
 302  
 Robert Guiscard saves pope in  
 246–247, 315
- Sabatini, Francesco 3n, 7n, 12n,  
 19–20, 30n, 50n, 51n, 52–53, 58n,  
 80n, 94n, 103–104, 110n, 111n  
 Sancia of Majorca, queen of Naples  
 44, 275, 277, 329  
 Sanseverino family  
 Roberto, prince of Salerno 96,  
 112  
 Roger 270, 278  
 S. Andrea a Nido (Naples) 217–  
 221, 306  
 S. Agostino (Naples) 45, 47  
 S. Chiara (Naples) 44, 48, 275–277  
 S. Domenico (Naples) 21n, 24, 43–  
 45, 47, 270–273, 326  
 S. Gennaro a Diaconia (Naples)  
 217  
 S. Gennaro fuori le mura (Naples)  
 77n, 155, 239–241  
 S. Giorgio di Mercato (Naples) 217  
 S. Giovanni delle Fonte (Naples)  
 218. See also Naples, cathedral of  
 S. Giovanni Maggiore (Naples) 25,  
 36, 40, 71, 98, 239–241, 308  
 S. Lorenzo (Naples) 45  
 S. Luigi (Aversa) 270–271, 326  
 S. Lucia (Naples) 239–241  
 S. Maria del Carmine (Naples) 43n  
 S. Maria del Principio (Naples)  
 218–223. See also Naples,  
 cathedral of  
 S. Maria di Montevergine (Naples)  
 45  
 S. Maria Donnaregina (Naples)  
 45n, 47, 144n  
 S. Maria Egiziaca (Naples) 45n  
 S. Maria in Cosmedin (Naples) 217  
 S. Maria Maddalena (Naples) 45n  
 S. Maria Rotonda (Naples) 217  
 S. Martino (Naples) 31n  
 S. Michele (Naples) 72  
 S. Paolo Maggiore (Naples) 65, 73,  
 77, 238–239, 288, 311  
 S. Patrizia (Naples) 35, 46, 71, 227–  
 231, 308–309. See also Patrizia,  
 saint  
 S. Pietro ad Ara (Naples) 201, 302

- S. Pietro a Castello (Naples) 270–271, 326
- S. Pietro Fusariello (Naples) 46
- S. Pietro Martire (Naples) 43n
- S. Restituta (Naples) 44, 48, 49, 85, 218–221, 306. See also Naples, cathedral of
- S. Silvestro dello Capo (Rome) 132, 144, 223–225
- SS. Giovanni e Paolo (Naples) 217
- SS. Nicandro e Marciano (Naples) 227–231
- Saracens 11, 71–74, 77, 90, 232–239, 241–242, 250, 309–313, 316, 335, 344
- Schipa, Michelangelo 29, 31n, 32n, 33n, 37n, 38n
- Scoppa, Lucio 79
- Silvester, pope 70, 77n, 98n, 214–216, 218–219, 221–225, 305, 307–308
- Seneca 57, 61, 64, 76, 181–182, 195–196, 293, 300
- Sicily 11, 35, 56, 57n, 81–82, 87, 88n, 91, 93, 100, 104n, 105, 107, 118, 124, 155, 170, 199, 214–215, 225, 243–244, 247–249, 250, 251, 252, 264, 320, 328, 334, 335, 336
- Sicilian Vespers 27, 29, 84, 92, 114, 265, 268–270, 325–326, 339
- Signinulfo family 85, 273–274, 328
- Bartolomeo 34, 35, 85, 273–274, 328
- Giovanni 37n
- Roberto 273–274, 328
- “Sito et conditione de Campania,” 108 110–113, 116, 119–121, 136
- Società napoletana di storia patria, Naples 92n, 98n, 115–116, 118–119, 123
- Solon 165, 285
- Somma (Somma Vesuviana) town of 24–25, 174–175, 291, 308
- chapel of S. Lucia in 24–25, 308
- alternate name for Mount Vesuvius 183
- Soria, Francescantonio 21, 104
- “Southernized Villani” (“SV”) 13, 15–16, 75n, 79n, 81n, 82–87, 92, 105–107, 110, 112–113, 115, 117, 118n, 119–120, 127–131, 133–134, 136–137, 147–148, 152, 254, 264, 316–328
- Spiegel, Gabrielle 49–50
- Spiritual Franciscans: see Franciscan order
- Staufen dynasty 11, 27, 34, 58, 74–75, 82–83, 86, 131, 321, 326. See also individual Staufen rulers
- Stefania (Naples), basilica of 44, 48–49, 179–182, 218, 231–238, 305–306. See also Naples, cathedral of
- Stella, Ingherammo 45, 46n
- Summonte, Giovanni Antonio 20–21, 79
- Tiberius, bishop of Naples 109
- Tiberius Julius Tarsus 65, 170–172, 178–180, 238–239, 288–289, 311, 341
- Tancred 81–82, 86, 253, 255–256, 318
- Thomas Aquinas, saint 22
- Thomas, Jean d’Amato 106n
- Tommaso de Chiavellis 96, 113
- “Trattato dei Bagni” 4n, 106n, 108, 110, 112, 114n, 115n, 116–117, 121, 124, 136, 148
- Troncarelli, Fabio 110n, 116n, 119n
- “Universal Villani Excerpt” (“UV”) 13, 16, 81n, 107, 110–113, 116–117, 118n, 119–120, 136, 148
- Vernacular literature
- beginnings in Campania 52–54
- Florentine influence on 52–54
- Valerius Maximus 51, 64, 175, 285, 291
- Vanzolini, Giuliano 121

- Venditti, Arnaldo 28n, 37n, 38n,  
52n, 53n, 55n, 56n
- Villani, Giovanni 14n, 52  
*Nuova Cronica*: as source for  
 “Southernized Villani,” 7 11–  
 13, 16, 79n, 81–83, 127–130,  
 318, 319, 321–324, 325, 327,  
 330  
 in “Universal Villani Excerpt,”  
 11–13 16  
 compared to *Cronaca di  
 Partenope* 8, 78  
 influence on redacted, “B”  
 version of *Cronaca di  
 Partenope*, 84 86, 99, 126–  
 131, 134n, 152, 254, 264,  
 318, 321–324, 325, 327, 330  
 wrongly identified as author of  
*Cronaca di Partenope* 11n,  
 21, 100, 107, 110, 115n, 116,  
 124, 137
- Villani, Giovanni Rumbo 21, 115n
- Vincenzo da Sessa 109
- Visconti dukes of Milan 87–88
- Vita Athanasii*, 71 76, 220, 294,  
 311–313. See also Athanasius,  
 saint, bishop of Naples
- Vita S. Aspren*, 68 303
- Vitale, Giuliana 28n, 29n, 32n,  
 33n, 34n, 35n, 37n, 38n, 40n, 42n,  
 45n, 98, 298
- Vitolo, Giovanni 4, 8n, 28n, 29n,  
 31n, 32n, 33n, 34n, 37n, 43n, 45n,  
 48n
- Virgil 51, 56–61, 76, 166–169, 170,  
 182, 184–200, 286–287, 299, 304  
*Aeneid* 56–60, 132–133, 135,  
 152, 167, 168, 286–287, 304  
 As magician in medieval legends  
 56, 58, 60, 62, 66–67, 76–77,  
 89, 144, 184–200, 294–302  
 Relation to “Commentary V,” 56–  
 58  
*Georgics* 57n, 61, 170, 287, 290  
 Tomb 17, 301–302
- Vulcano family 34  
 Andrea 39n  
 Riccardo 39n  
 Hector 42n
- Waitz, Georg 3n, 72n, 77n, 109,  
 292, 294, 305, 310, 312, 313
- Wickham, Chris 8n
- William, duke of Apulia and  
 Calabria 247–248, 315
- William I, king of Sicily 130, 248,  
 250–253, 316–317
- William II “the Good,” king of Sicily  
 253–255, 317–318
- Zoso: see Brancaccio